DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 283 UD 011 658

AUTHOR	Walther, Regis H.
TITLE	A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-Of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs. The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op: A Formal Skill Training Program.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Apr 69
NOTE	131p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Dropout Programs, Federal Programs, Job Placement, *Job Skills, *Program Descriptions, Social Characteristics, *Success Factors, *Summative Evaluation, Work Experience, *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

This is a report of the results of the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op, a formal skill training program designed to enhance the clerical employability of out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees in Cincinnati. This program alternates cycles of work experience in firms that are potential employers and training in relevant skills and behaviors in a Neighborhood Youth Corps Educational Center. The sample consisted of 127 enrollees; data included enrollment, program experience, and followup information. Compared to a control group, significantly more of the Co-Op subjects had achieved a good adjustment to the world of work. Age and school grade completed were associated with success. The employment effectiveness of this program suggests the value of other programs modeled on Co-Op procedures. (Author/DM)

ED052283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED OUT-OF-SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAMS

The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op: A Formal Skill Training Program

April, 1969

Social Research Group
The George Washington University, Wash., D.C.
Regis H. Walther, Principal Investigator
Margaret L. Magnusson, Research Associate

Contract No.41-7-004-9
Manpower Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

UD011658

Abstract

This paper reports the results of a study of the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op, a formal skill training program designed to enhance the clerical employability of out-of-school NYC enrollees in Cincinnati. This program alternates cycles of work experience in firms that are potential employers and training in relevant skills and behaviors in an NYC Educational Center. This study was undertaken as a component of research covering the effectiveness of selected, urban, out-of-school NYC programs.

The Co-Op study group was composed of all enrollees entering the program from May, 1966, until a desirable group size of 127 subjects had been obtained. Study data included information at the time of enrollment, information reflecting program experience, and follow-up information concerning the employment sequels to Co-Op experience. Follow-up enrollee information was secured from 97 percent of the Co-Op subjects, and from 100 percent of the employers identified in enrollee follow-up.

The Co-Op program provides formal clerical skill training for NYC enrollees who are reasonably good prospects for clerical employment--high school graduates whose vocational preparation in school had not been sufficient to gain entry-level employability or dropouts with a potential for achieving in the clerical field. The enrollees in the Co-Op study averaged 11.1 school grades completed, a reading grade level of 8.4, an arithmetic grade level of 6.8, and they placed, on the average, in the 35th percentile in General Clerical Skills. The Co-Op enrollees did not appear to be different from NYC female enrollees in general in the matters of schooling, number of children, welfare assistance, or recorded police contacts.

The distinctive features of the Co-Op program included training cycles composed of classroom and work experience. Work supervisor evaluations guided the emphasis of ensuing classroom work, and the training cycles were repeated until entry-level employability and placement were achieved. As the program developed, work experience in the offices of cooperating businesses replaced work assignments to regular NYC work sites. Business work experience was deemed to provide more realistic training with respect to both supervision and quality of training, and possessed the practical advantage of specific placement potential. During work assignments, Co-Op enrollees were on the payroll of the cooperating firm and many of them became regular employees of these firms after completing their Co-Op training.

Follow-up information secured in the summer of 1968 indicated that 86 percent of the Co-Op subjects were in the labor force, and that 60 percent of them had post-Co-Op employment. Compared to a Control group, very significantly more of the Co-Op subjects had achieved a good adjustment to the world of work. Comparisons of "successful" and "unsuccessful" Co-Op subjects indicated that age and school grade completed were associated with a successful employment outcome.

The employment effectiveness of the Co-Op program suggests the value of other applications of formal skill training programs modeled on Co-Op procedures. The essential elements of such a model skill training program are:

1. Selection of job categories for which there are ample employment opportunites and training at a minimal level of competence can be accomplished within six months.

2. Initial training at a Training Center for a period of three to six weeks.

3. On-the-job training for a period of about four weeks, preferably at a work site that provides opportunities for permanent employment.

4. Reassignment to Training Center, concentrating on work deficiencies reported by work supervisor during last work assignment.

5. Provision for remedial education as required.

6. Continuation of the cycle of work experience and formal training until enrollee has been judged ready for employment. Enrollee should be reassigned to a new work site whenever this appears to be necessary.

7. Assistance in obtaining a job after training has been completed.

8. Follow-up counseling until enrollee has made an adequate adjustment to a job.

CONTENTS

		Page
	Abstract	i
	Contents	iv
	List of Tables	vi
I	Introduction	1
II	The Co-Op Program	3
III	The Co-Op Study	8
	Follow-up Completions	10
IV	Co-Op Stujects at the Time of Enrollment	13
	Enrollee Characteristics	13
	Head of Household	17
	Occupational Preparation	18
	Clerical Skills	20
	Occupational Goal	20
	Test Results	22
	Interviewer Impressions	24
	Summary	26
V	The Co-Op Experience--Program Data	28
	Length of Enrollment	28
	Classroom and Work Experience	29
	Co-Op Classroom Experience	32
	Classroom Experience Outside of Co-Op	32
	Co-Op Work Experience	33
	Co-Op Counseling	35
	Improvements During Co-Op Enrollment	35
	Areas of Improvement	37
	Comparison of Interviewer Impressions on Enrollment and Termination	38
	Work Supervisor Evaluations	38
	Termination Testing	40
	Summary	42

CONTENTS, Con't.

Page

VI Experience After Co-Op 43

Months out of Co-Op 43
Labor Market Status at Time of Follow-Up 44
Housewives and the Labor Market 46
Employment after Co-Op 46
Labor Force Status and Employment after Co-Op 49
Employer Reports of Employment after Co-Op 51
Employment Effectiveness 57
Comparisons between "Successful" and "Unsuccessful" Co-Op Subjects 58
Summary 62

VII Enrollees' Views of Co-Op 64

Enrollees' Reasons for Leaving Co-Op 64
Enrollees' Ratings 66
Examples of Counselor and Supervisor Helpfulness 66
Designated Useful Aspects of Co-Op Experience 69
Enrollees' Descriptions of Most Useful Co-Op Experience 71
What Enrollees Disliked About Co-Op 73
"What Might Make a Person Want to Get into Co-Op?" 75
"What Might Make a Person Not Want to Get into Co-Op?" 75
Enrollees' Occupational Goals 77
Enrollees' Estimates of Goal Achievement 79
Impediments to Goal Achievement 80
"Successful" and "Unsuccessful" Enrollees 81
Summary 85

VIII Case Studies 87

IX Conclusions 118

Elements of Program Effectiveness 118
Possible Improvements 120
Essential Elements in Formal Skill Training Programs 121

List of Tables

Table Page

1 FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION, CO-OP SUBJECTS 11

2 FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION, EMPLOYERS OF CO-OP SUBJECTS 12

3 ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS AT THE TIME OF ENROLLMENT, CO-OP STUDY SAMPLE 14

4 REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, ENROLLEE REPORTS AND SCHOOL RECORDS 16

5 HEAD OF ENROLLEE'S HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT 17

6 REASONS NO LONGER EMPLOYED 19

7 SITES OF OCCUPATIONAL PREPARATION 19

8 NYC EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT IN CO-OP, NYC STAFF REPORTS 20

9 WHAT WORK CAN YOU DO NOW? ENROLLEES' REPORTS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT 21

10 OCCUPATIONAL GOALS 21

11 MEAN TEST RESULTS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT 23

12 ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, CO-OP STAFF REPORTS 25

13 NYC EXPERIECNE PRIOR TO CO-OP, AND MEAN MONTHS IN CO-OP 29

14 NUMBER OF WORK EXPERIENCES 30

15 NYC AND BUSINESS WORK EXPERIENCES 30

16 AREAS OF PRACTICE AND INSTRUCTION--CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE 33

17 CLERICAL SKILLS PRACTICED--WORK EXPERIENCE 34

18 MEAN HOURS OF COUNSELING 36

19 RELATIVE EMPHASES IN AREAS OF PERSONAL COUNSEL 36

20 AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT DURING CO-OP ENROLLMENT 37

21 COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWER IMPRESSIONS ON ENROLLMENT AND ON TERMINATION 39

List of Tables, Con't.

Table Page

22 COMPARISON OF "BELOW-AVERAGE" WORK SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS, FIRST AND LAST WORK ASSIGNMENTS 41

23 COMPARISON OF ENROLLMENT AND TERMINATION TEST RESULTS 41

24 LABOR MARKET STATUS AT TIME OF FOLLOW-UP 45

25 NUMBER OF JOBS AFTER CO-OP 47

26 DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB 47

27 REFERRAL TO CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB 48

28 MAIN REASON NO LONGER HAVE JOB 49

29 SUBJECTS IN THE LABOR FORCE AT THE TIME OF FOLLOW-UP, LABOR FORCE STATUS, MONTHS OUT OF CO-OP, AND EMPLOYMENT 50

30 SUBJECTS IN THE LABOR FORCE AT THE TIME OF FOLLOW-UP, EMPLOYMENT AFTER CO-OP, NUMBER OF JOBS, AND REFERRAL TO MOST RECENT JOB 51

31 DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, EMPLOYER REPORTS 52

32 TERMINATIONS AND REASONS FOR TERMINATION, EMPLOYER REPORTS 54

33 RATINGS OF OVERALL JOB PERFORMANCE, EMPLOYER REPORTS 55

34 PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDE RATINGS, EMPLOYER REPORTS 56

35 WORK ADJUSTMENT, CO-OP SUBJECTS AND CONTROL GROUP 58

36 SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" CO-OP SUBJECTS--MEAN COMPARISONS .60

37 PERCENTAGE COMPARISONS, "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" CO-OP SUBJECTS 62

38 ENROLLEES' REASONS FOR LEAVING CO-OP 65

39 ENROLLEES' RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF COUNSELORS AND SUPERVISORS, AND OVERALL USEFULNESS OF CO-OP 67

40 ENROLLEES' EXAMPLES OF COUNSELOR AND SUPERVISOR HELPFULNESS 68

41 ENROLLEES' MENTIONED AND MOST USEFUL ASPECTS OF CO-OP 70

List of Tables, Con't.

Table Page

42 ENROLLEES' DESCRIPTIONS OF MOST USEFUL CO-OP EXPERIENCES 72

43 WHAT ENROLLEES DISLIKED ABOUT CO-OP 74

44 ENROLLEES' VIEWS OF "WHAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON WANT TO GET INTO CO-OP" 76

45 ENROLEES' VIEWS OF "WHAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON NOT WANT TO GET INTO CO-OP" 77

46 ENROLLEES' OCCUPATIONAL GOALS 78

47 ENROLLEES' ESTIMATES OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL GOALS . . . 80

48 ENROLLEES' VIEWS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO OCCUPATIONAL GOAL ACHIEVEMENT 81

49 ENROLLEE-REPORTED VARIABLES, "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" SUBJECTS 83

I

Introduction

This paper reports the results of a study of the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op, a formal clerical skill-training program which is a component of the Cincinnati Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Co-Op study was part of an investigation of the effectiveness of selected out-of-school NYC programs. The general plan of this NYC research involved: (1) the selection of promising programs as research sites; (2) the constitution of Experimental study groups (youth with NYC experience) and Control study groups (similar youth without NYC experience); and (3) the comparative analysis of Experimental-Control data in post-NYC periods. The research plan also called for the investigation of promising program components. As such, the Co-Op recommended itself and the Co-Op study was accordingly initiated in the fall of 1966.

The Co-Op's distinctive features included: (1) the selection of trainees on the basis of at least minimal clerical skills and motivation for clerical employment; (2) the provision for employability improvement in two settings—the classroom setting of the NYC Education Center, and the office setting of work assignments; (3) the alternation of classroom and work experience in repeated cycles, with the emphasis of classroom work governed by weaknesses disclosed in work assignment performance; and (4) placement help when entry-level employability had been achieved. These features promised a realistic training program with the capacity for flexible responses to various and changing employability needs.

The Co-Op study group was constituted by placing all enrollees in the program, beginning with May, 1966, enrollments, until approximately 125 subjects had been identified. Information concerning these enrollees was collected as they participated in the program, and follow-up information was secured from them after they had left the Co-Op. The Co-Op study thus provided information in three main areas: (1) the characteristics of Co-Op subjects (sometimes called moderator variables); (2) the characteristics of Co-Op experience (sometimes called treatment variables); and (3) the adjustments of Co-Op subjects to the world of work (sometimes called criterion variables). These three areas form, to some extent, a chronological sequence, and the results of the Co-Op study have been presented in this order.

The following chapter describes the Co-Op program, and Chapter III describes the Co-Op study. The characteristics of Co-Op subjects at the time of enrollment are reported in Chapter IV, and the characteristics of Co-Op experience, based on program information, are reported in Chapter V. Post-program experience, particularly the employment adjustments of Co-Op subjects, is reported in Chapter VI. This chapter utilizes both enrollee and employer follow-up information. The enrollees' retrospective views of their Co-Op experience, taken from enrollee follow-up information, are reported in Chapter VII. Chapter VIII presents 16 case histories, developed from all sources of information available to this study. Finally, Chapter IX reports our conclusions and their possible implications for NYC effectiveness.

II

The Co-Op Program

In May, 1966, the Cincinnati Neighborhood Youth Corps established its clerical Co-Op program--a program designed to improve the clerical skills, work habits, and job-seeking activities of qualified enrollees to the point of permanent employment in the clerical field. As originally planned, participation in the Co-Op was to be limited to NYC enrollees who had completed at least 10th grade, who possessed at least minimal clerical skills, and who had expressed an interest in clerical work as a permanent vocation. In addition, Co-Op participation was restricted to individuals whose potential for success in the clerical field was judged to be at least average--whose evaluation tests indicated ability to handle basic mathematics and at least 8th grade reading ability.

Intake testing for the Co-Op was performed by the NYC's Evaluation Unit and included the following tests: Revised Beta, Gates Reading Survey, Arithmetic Computation, General Clerical Test, Dexterity Test, and Typing Test. The testing program of the Co-Op also included plans to re-evaluate trainees after a minimum of three months of Co-Op experience by re-testing in reading, arithmetic, and clerical skills. This testing program was not uniformly followed.

Originally, the Co-Op program alternated three weeks of classroom work at the NYC Education Center with three weeks of work experience in NYC offices. At the end of each work experience, the trainee's supervisor provided performance evaluations and indicated skill and behavioral areas in which improvement was desirable. These supervisor reports guided the emphasis of the ensuing three-week period of classroom work. Following a second period of classroom work, the trainee went on a second work assignment--usually in a different NYC office in order to obtain diversified work experience. The program provided for repeated cycles of classroom and work experience until the trainee qualified for and achieved permanent placement. When the program was set up, it was anticipated that most trainees would be ready for entry jobs in the clerical field with from three to six months of Co-Op training.

At the outset, the Co-Op served some 40 trainees, most of whom transferred to the Co-Op from NYC jobslots. Subsequently, many Co-Op participants were referred to the Co-Op directly from NYC Intake, but the Co-Op continued to serve as a training resource for NYC enrollees whose NYC experience had started in regular NYC work assignments. The Co-Op tended to enlarge with the passage of time: it had 55 active participants in October, 1966, and 63, in May, 1968.

As the Co-Op gained experience, the original plan was modified in some respects. By the end of 1966, the program was operating with four-week periods of classroom and work experience and with work sites in User Agencies[1] as well as in NYC offices. The work-experience phase of the program continued to evolve. Assignments to office experience in the business world replaced NYC assignments, and successive assignments to the same business tended to replace diversified assignments. By May, 1967, the Co-Op had become a "business" Co-Op with all participants getting their work experience outside of the NYC. Cooperating firms paid the trainees according to their own pay schedules for a regular work week.

In theory, about half of the Co-Op participants would be working at the Education Center in any given period while the rest would be in the work-experience

[1] The out-of-school NYC provides work experience in the non-private sector. Organizations in this sector (hospitals, municipal departments, and the like) are User Agencies.

phase of the program. In practice, the number of participants at the Center tended to be more than half. All recruits to the Co-Op in the first phase of the program plus more seasoned participants in the classroom phase of the program were at the Center. The portion of participants at the Center was further augmented by participants, able to qualify for employment solely through their work at the Center, who did not go through the work-experience phase of the program. With the transition to business work sites, furthermore, a higher level of employability was often necessary for work site assignment, and the duration of the classroom phase of the program was correspondingly lengthened in such cases. On the other hand, some participants were quickly assigned to work stations, did well in their assignments, and were hired from their first work experience as regular employees by their Co-Op employer. The number of shortened or by-passed classroom phases was more than offset, however, by the number of extended or exclusive classroom phases; and over-crowding tended to result at the Education Center.

The NYC Education Center in Cincinnati began operations on January 24, 1966. It was staffed by two NYC Education Counselors, a Typing and Office Skills Instructor, and a part-time Reading Instructor "loaned" from the Board of Education. The Center moved to larger quarters in a high school in August, 1966.

Co-Op training at the Education Center was set up by specialists in the field and was based on a survey of local business requirements for clerk-typists. An October, 1966, report listed the following areas of training:

Basic Education--Spelling, Business English, Grammar (11th or 12th grade equivalent), Vocabulary Building, Proficiency in language usage, Business Math.

Typing--Speed of 40-50 WPM, with experience on both manual and electric typewriters, and with various materials, such as Stencils, Statistical typing, Correspondence, Reports, and Outlines.

Office Machines--Mimeographing, Transcriber, Ten-Key Adding Machine, Bookkeeping Machine.

Clerical Skills--Filing (Chronological, Numerical, and Geographical) Telephone Usage, Shorthand and Shorthand dictation.

Job Sophistication--Personal Hygiene, Grooming, Clothes Selection, Manners, Speech, Care of Hair, Use of Cosmetics.

Group counseling was routinely used in Job Sophistication and in orientation to the Co-Op. In addition, the Education Counselors provided individual counseling related to family, personal and health problems, work site problems, and to permanent employment.

The trainee's day at the Education Center typically runs from 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., five days a week, with an hour out for lunch and a 15 minute break each morning and afternoon. An hour and a half of Counseling is scheduled daily, together with 45 minutes of Group Counseling and an additional half-hour of Group Counseling on Fridays. Actual classroom schedules vary somewhat with the needs of the trainee and with the availability of teaching facilities.

An important part of Co-Op training--not listed in the "curriculum" but "taught" ubiquitously in Basic Education exercises, Job Sophistication "classes," and counseling sessions--is the development of attitudes and behaviors that lead to successful job-seeking. Practice in typing and employment tests, and with employment interviews and forms is stressed so that the trainee will have the self-confidence to secure a job once she has achieved the requisite level of performance.

Permanent placement, the objective of Co-Op training, is undertaken when a trainee's abilities qualify her for an entry job in the clerical field. At this time, the trainee's folder is sent to the NYC Placement Unit, together with the Co-Op's recommendations for placement. The trainee is also registered with the Youth Opportunity Center and with the Employment Service. A program of job interviews is then planned by the trainee and her counselor. Often the placement period is very short. Some trainees are hired directly from their business work assignments, and some trainees may "walk" into jobs that are known to be available through the Placement Unit of the public employment services.

Cincinnati's clerical Co-Op was instituted with two types of young women in mind: high school graduates who had completed the Office Practice curriculum, but who, nevertheless, lacked the skills needed for entry jobs in the clerical field; and 11th or 12th grade dropouts with a high potential for achieving in the clerical field. It was observed that the receptiveness of such young women to further training would be conditional upon direct relation of the training to a realistic job venture. As planned, the Co-Op provided this direct relation in the sustained focus on clerical employment, in the reality of work experience, and in the relation of classroom experience to successful clerical performance. The selection of trainees whose abilities and motivation indicated potentially successful clerical performance, together with a program geared to their needs, held out the promise that the vocational objectives of the Co-Op program would be achieved.

The promise of the Co-Op led to its selection as the subject of special study. The objectives and design of the Co-Op study are described in the next chapter of this report.

III

The Co-Op Study

Beginning in May, 1966, the Co-Op study sample was constituted by placing each entrant into the Co-Op in the sample until a desirable N of approximately 125 had been achieved. Well over a year was needed to achieve a sample of this size. Information concerning each Co-Op subject was collected at three periods in time: (1) on entrance into the program; (2) during the period of Co-Op participation; and (3) in the summer of 1968, when most subjects had completed thier Co-Op experience.

Study Forms

Standard NYC Enrollee Record forms (#16) were available for all Co-Op subjects. At the time of Co-Op enrollment, a Beginning Interview[1] was completed for each subject, usually by the Education Supervisor. This interview provided baseline information: the subject's occupational preparation, experience and goal, and the interviewer's impressions of the subject's appearance, speech, and attitude. A summary of the subject's school record and a report of police contacts, if any, were also included in the Beginning Interview form.

Supervisors' evaluations of the subject's performance in work assignments were available in two kinds of forms. In the first months of the Co-Op, when work assignments were in NYC offices, a two-page evaluation form was used.[2] Later, when

[1] A copy of Beginning Interview, Co-Op I, is attached as Appendix A.

[2] A copy of the evaluation form is attached as Appendix B.

work assignments were in business offices, a one-page progress report[1] was used. Since most of the items in the progress reports also appeared in the longer evaluation forms, progress report information was generally available for all subjects.

Co-Op II[2], a form completed when the subject terminated from Co-Op, paralleled Co-Op I's information concerning the subject's appearance, speech, attitude, and occupational goal. This form also provided a record of the subject's Co-Op experience--the results of initial and subsequent tests, the character and duration of work assignments, training and counseling emphases, and the nature of termination.

Follow-up information was primarily secured from the subjects' completions of Enrollee Questionnaires.[3] These forms were mailed to all subjects at the end of May, 1968, together with a covering letter requesting their cooperation and promising to pay $1.50 for each completed form. Successive mailings, repeating requests to complete Enrollee Questionnaires, were sent to non-respondents.

Some Co-Op subjects were also subjects in our Retrospective and Prospective Experimental study groups. These subjects received the first mailed request to complete the Enrollee Questionnaire. Non-respondents to the first request, however, did not receive additional requests. Instead, reliance was placed on the interviewing process, and follow-up information for these subjects was taken from the interview forms used in the respective studies.

[1] A copy of the progress report form is attached as Appendix C.

[2] A copy of the Termination Interview, Co-Op II, is attached as Appendix D.

[3] A copy of the Enrollee Questionnaire is attached as Appendix E.

Co-Op subjects who had not responded by the third wave of mailed requests and who were not in our Retrospective or Prospective studies were contacted, whenever possible, by interviewers who assisted them in completing the Enrollee Questionnaire.

One of the items in the Enrollee Questionnaire and in the Retrospective and Prospective interview forms identified the subject's most recent employer. With the completion of follow-up forms, it became possible to mail requests to these employers to (1) verify employment, and (2) secure a short performance rating.[1] Non-respondents to the first mailed requests received a second request, and non-respondents to the second request received a telephoned reminder.

Follow-Up Completions

Slightly more than one-third of the Co-Op subjects completed Enrollee Questionnaires in response to our first mailed request (see Table 1). Successive requests increased the proportion of self-report to 54 percent. Interviewing increased the follow-up completion to 97 percent.

Employer follow-up information could not, of course, be sought for the six Co-Op subjects who had not terminated from the program at the time of follow-up or for the subjects who had no post-Co-Op employment.

---

[1] A copy of the Employee Work Performance Form is attached as Appendix F.

TABLE 1

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION, CO-OP SUBJECTS

	Number	Percent
Enrollee Self-Report		
Wave 1	45	35%
Wave 2	15	12
Wave 3	9	7
Total Self-Report	69	54%
Interview		
Retrospective Study	5	4%
Prospective Study	13	10
Self-Report form	36	28
Total Interview	54	43%[a]
TOTAL SELF-REPORT & INTERVIEW	123	97%
No Information	4	3%
TOTAL	127	100%

[a] Totals more than subparts due to rounding error.

All told, 82 percent of the Co-Op sample identified post-Co-Op employers (see Table 2). All of these employers responded to our requests for information although requests had to be repeated for 28 percent of them. Usable information was obtained from all of the responses, although one employer would only confirm the fact of employment and another "employer" reported no record of the subject's employment.

TABLE 2

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION, EMPLOYERS OF CO-OP SUBJECTS

	Number	Percent
Post Co-Op Employer Not Identified	23	18%
Post Co-Op Employer Identified	104	82
Total	127	100%
Employer Work Performance Information		
Wave 1	75	72%
Wave 2	17	16
Telephone follow-up	12	12
Total	104	100%

IV

Co-Op Subjects at the Time of Enrollment

As each subject in the Co-Op study entered the program, a member of the Co-Op staff recorded enrollee data and initial impressions of the enrollee on a Beginning Interview Form Co-Op I.[1] This form also contained information taken from school and police records. A copy of the standard NYC Enrollee Record (NYC 16)--completed at the time of NYC enrollment--was appended to the Beginning Interview Form. This chapter reports the information from these forms, together with the results of initial Co-Op testing.[2]

Enrollee Characteristics

Almost all of the subjects in the Co-Op study were young Negro women (see Table 3). As of May, 1966, their average age was just under 19 years. On the average, they had completed 11.1 school grades, and had been out of school nearly 14 months when they enrolled in the NYC.

Fifty-six percent of the Co-Op subjects had never held a job lasting 30 days or more. Those that had held such a job averaged nearly five months of unemployment just prior to enrollment. Four-fifths of the Co-Op subjects were long-time Cincinnatians, and a little more than one-third of them were long-time residents of their neighborhoods. The Co-Op subjects were similar in these respects to other NYC enrollees in our studies: typically, these enrollees are urban youths who have been ill-served by their city's educational and employment systems. The successful adjustment of these young people to the world of work requires additional preparation.

[1] See Appendix A.

[2] Test results were recorded in Co-Op II, a copy of which is attached as Appendix B.

TABLE 3

ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS AT THE TIME OF ENROLLMENT, CO-OP STUDY SAMPLE

Characteristic		
		Number
Negro female		120
White female		6
Negro male		1
	Total	127
		Mean
Age (as of May, 1966)		18.9 years
Highest school grade completed		11.1 grades
Months out of school		13.9 months
Held job, weeks since last job of 30 days or more		19.9 weeks
		Percent
Completed 10th grade or less		26%
Never held job of 30 days or more		56
In metropolitan area 11 or more years		81
In neighborhood 11 or more years		36
In public housing		14
Family receives welfare assistance		24
One or more recorded police contacts		21
Single, never married		74
Own children in household		55

The Co-Op subjects did not differ significantly[1] from the Cincinnati Retrospective Experimental study group in percentages in public housing and percentage receiving welfare assistance. Compared to female subjects in a special study of police contacts in Cincinnati,[2] the Co-Op subjects did not differ significantly in the percentage with recorded police contacts prior to enrollment. Backgrounds of welfare and trouble with the law indicate particular employment adjustment problems. These problems were as extensive in the Co-Op program as they were in the Cincinnati NYC program generally.

About three-fourths of the Co-Op subjects were single girls, and at least two-fifths of these single girls had children. NYC female enrollees frequently are unmarried mothers--a circumstance that relates to their employability needs in several ways. In the first place, more than half of the school dropouts were probably caused by the enrollee's pregnancy (see Table 4). Enrollee reports of reasons for leaving school indicated that 51 percent of the dropouts were due to "health" or pregnancy. School adjustment reasons (academic and discipline) were reported by only eight percent of the dropouts, and pregnancy might well have been a factor in other "reasons" although not reported as such. School records of reasons for leaving school indicated that 24 percent of the dropouts were due to health or pregnancy, and that 14 percent were associated with poor school performance. The remainder of dropout reasons in school records (including 29 percent "no report") probably reflected pregnancies to some extent. Both the enrollee and the school reports of reasons for leaving school indicated that unsatisfactory school performance was a relatively minor cause of school dropout, and that circumstances apart from school performance were associated with the great majority of dropouts. The most frequently mentioned circumstance associated with school dropout was health or pregnancy.

---

[1] In this report, "significant" is reserved for confidence levels of .05 or less. Confidence levels describe the degree of assurance that differences did not occur through chance, and an .05 confidence level would indicate that differences could be attributed to chance no more than 5 times in 100. "Not significant" represents confidence levels greater than .05 and indicates that differences should be attributed to chance.

[2] This special study, "The Relationship Between Out-of-School NYC Experience and Enrollees' Police Record," involved 58 females, 29 percent of whom had records of police contact before their application to NYC. In the Co-Op study, 21 percent of the (substantially female) sample had police records. Although there is an eight percent difference, the extent of the difference is within the range of that which should be attributed to chance.

Responsibility for the support of their children accentuates the importance of employment for many female enrollees. At the same time, child-care responsibilities often interfere with the enrollee's performance both in work-training and in work.

TABLE 4

REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL, ENROLLEE REPORTS AND SCHOOL RECORDS

Reasons	Enrollee Reports	School Records
Summary:	(N=127)	(N=127)
Graduated	45%	43%
Dropped out before graduating	55	57
Total	100%	100%
Dropout reasons:	(N-70)	(N=72)
Health, pregnancy	51%	24%
Marriage	0	6
Economic	11	3
Academic	4	14[a]
Discipline	4	0
Other (moved, family problems)	26	25
No report	3	29
Total	99%	101%[b]

[a] Includes "age."

[b] Totals more than 100 percent due to rounding error. Throughout this report, percentages have been rounded and, consequently, do not always sum to 100.

Head of Household

At the time of enrollment, a little more than two-thirds of the Co-Op study subjects were members of what might be termed "parent" households: family units headed by the enrollees' parents or, in some cases, by other relatives (see Table 5). Broken homes, indicated by households headed by mothers, were equally as prevalent as two-parent households, indicated by father-headed families.

Nearly one-third of the Co-Op enrollees had households of their own, and about half of these were husband-wife family units. The sole male subject in the Co-Op study was married and the head of his own household.

TABLE 5

HEAD OF ENROLLEE'S HOUSEHOLD AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT

Head of Household	Number	Percent
"Parent" household:		
Father, male guardian	39	31%
Mother, female guardian	37	29
Other relative	11	9
"Own" household:		
Enrollee's husband	19	15%
Enrollee	20	16
Other	1	1
Total	127	101%

Employment Experience

Eligibility for the NYC out-of-school program includes unemployment, and ipso facto all Co-Op study subjects were in need of enhanced employability. As we have seen (Table 3) 56 percent of these enrollees had never held a job lasting 30 days or more. About half of these enrollees ascribed their unemployment to the fact that they had been unable to find work, or to find a desirable job, and about half indicated that they had not been ready to work, having no salable skills, or having no available time (family responsibilities). Help in finding employment and the acquisition of salable job skills were their salient employability needs.

The employment experience of Co-Op enrollees who had held jobs for 30 days or more showed the same salient employability needs.and, in addition, highlighted the need to achieve better personal adjustments to the world of work. Enrollees who had had some job experience had been unemployed nearly five months, on the average, when they enrolled (see Table 3) and obviously had not achieved anything like a satisfactory adjustment to the world of work. Nearly half of these enrollees had rejected (or been rejected by) their most recent employer (see Table 6). Slightly more than one-fifth of these enrollees had found impermanent jobs and had become unemployed when the job ended. Personal circumstances apparently unrelated to the job or to job performance accounted for the rest of the most recent job terminations.

Occupational Preparation

When they enrolled in the Co-Op, almost all of the Co-Op study subjects reported some occupational preparation (see Table 7). Two sites--high school and the NYC--had provided most of this preparation.

The question asking where the Co-Op subject had received occupational preparation was not restricted to clerical occupations. Most of the preparation in the NYC, however, was relevant to clerical work (see Table 8).

TABLE 6

REASONS NO LONGER EMPLOYED

Reasons		Number	Percent
Job ended		11	22%
Quit		18	36
Left for better job		2	4
Was fired		3	6
Ill-health, pregnancy		6	12
Moved		4	8
Went back to school		5	10
Other		1	2
No report		6	--
Never held job for 30 days or more		71	--
	Total	127	100%

TABLE 7

SITES OF OCCUPATIONAL PREPARATION
CO-OP SAMPLE (N=127)

Site		Percent
High School		72%
NYC		40
Adult education		10
Business school, trade school		4
MDTA		4
Other, including experience		6
None		3
	Total[a]	139%

[a] More than one site could be reported.

TABLE 8

NYC EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT IN CO-OP, NYC STAFF REPORTS

NYC Experience		Number	Percent
NYC Experience:			
Clerical assignments only		40	32%
Clerical and non-clerical assignments		2	2
Non-clerical assignments only		8	6
No NYC experience		77	61
	Total	127	101%

Clerical Skills

Cincinnati's Clerical Co-Op was set up to enhance clerical skills; and, as planned, each participant would possess minimal clerical skills. Most of the Co-Op study subjects at the time of enrollment felt that they were able to do clerical work (see Table 9). About half of them reported typing skills, and about one-third of them reported that they were able to do office work other than typing. At the same time, 14 percent of the Co-Op subjects felt unqualified, at the time of enrollment, to do any sort of clerical work.

Occupational Goal

Most of the Co-Op subjects had occupational goals in the clerical field (see Table 10). About one in ten had professional or semi-professional goals for which clerical placement might serve as a stepping-stone.

TABLE 9

WHAT WORK CAN YOU DO NOW?
ENROLLEES' REPORTS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT

Work	Number	Percent
Office clerical:		
Typing and other office work	51	41%
Typing only	14	11
Other office work only	43	34
Other	11	9
Can do no work now	6	5
No report	2	--
Total	127	100%

TABLE 10

OCCUPATIONAL GOALS

Goal	Number	Percent
Professional, Semi-Professional		
Teacher, Social Worker, Nurse, IBM Programmer	14	11%
Clerical		
Clerical or stenographic, including private or administrative secretary, receptionist, key punch, card sorter and verifier	109	86
Other		
Beautician, hospital worker	4	3
Total	127	100%

All of the Co-Op subjects reported occupational goals and none of them gave occupationally irrelevant goals such as "marriage" or "making money." They differed very significantly[1] in this respect from female subjects in the Cincinnati Retrospective Experimental sample, 12 percent of whom either had no occupational goal or had irrelevant goals.[2] One of the desiderata of Co-Op participation was, of course, interest in clerical work. Knowledge of this circumstance might have influenced responses in this area to some extent. So far as enrollee reports go, however, the occupational goals of the Co-Op subjects indicated very widespread relevance of the Co-Op to the life-plans of Co-Op participants.

Not only did most of the Co-Op subjects have occupational goals that fitted in with Co-Op training, but most of them (88 percent) also considered that their chances of achieving their goals were "reasonably good" or "excellent."

Test Results

As planned, each participant was to be tested on enrollment and at intervals subsequent to enrollment.[3] Had this plan been executed, these test results would have provided valuable evidence of the effect of the Co-Op program. The Co-Op testing program did not, however, conform to expectations and test results are less inclusive than had been planned.

---

[1] "Very significant" is reserved, in this report, to describe confidence levels of .01 or less.

[2] See, "A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of the Cincinnati Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Program," page 39.

[3] The tests used were the Revised Beta, Gates Reading Survey, Arithmetic Computation (published by Bobbs-Merrill Co.) and the General Clerk Test.

Almost all (93 percent) of the Co-Op subjects were tested at the time of enrollment in reading grade level and they averaged a grade level of 8.4 (see Table 11). In other words, the Co-Op subjects were reading about three grades below their school grade level (see Table 3). A little more than four-fifths of the Co-Op subjects were tested in math, and they averaged a math grade level of 6.8--about a grade and a half below average tested reading grade level. A little more than half of the Co-Op subjects were tested with the Beta (general intelligence) test and with a General Clerical Skills test. They averaged 101 in the former (100 is considered "average") and in the 35th percentile in the latter.

Test results indicated that, notwithstanding an average school grade completion of 11.1, Co-Op subjects had, on the average, 8th grade reading ability and 7th grade math ability. The general clerical skill level of Co-Op subjects who were tested in this area was considerably below midscale. Forty-four percent of the Co-Op subjects, however, were not tested as to general clerical skills. The "average" score received on the Beta is hard to interpret because of absence of validity information about what the test measures.

TABLE 11

MEAN TEST RESULTS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT

Test	Number Tested	Percent of Sample Tested	Mean
Reading Grade Level	118	93%	8.4
Math Grade Level	103	81	6.8
General Clerical Skills Percentile	71	56	35.4
Beta (general intelligence)	68	53	101.0

Interviewer Impressions

The final section of the Beginning Interview provided for ratings of enrollees in terms of the impression made on the interviewer. Each rating area was described by polar adjectives weighted 1 and 5; for example, the appearance rating of dress ranged from 1 (inappropriate dress) to 5 (appropriate dress). The results of these ratings provided a general indication of areas in which the enrollee needed improvement and which might be improved through training and counsel.

Means of these ratings were all well above scale midpoint, ranging from 3.4 (speech) to 3.9 (healthy appearance and friendly attitude). Below midpoint ratings (1 or 2) accordingly represented salient employability needs. On the basis of below-midscale ratings, the Co-Op subjects were most apt to need help in the matters of dress (appropriateness and neatness), speech (clarity, fluency, and correctness), and of confidence (see Table 12). From 10 to 17 percent of the Co-Op subjects impressed the Beginning Interviewer as being deficient in these respects.

Most Co-Op subjects were midpoint or above in the rated areas of interviewer impressions, and most of them (95 percent) were thought to have a "reasonable" occupational goal.

Notwithstanding the fact that almost all (98 percent) of the Co-Op subjects were rated average or above in healthy appearance, 57 percent were found--on professional examination--to be in need of medical or dental treatment. This treatment was provided for most (91 percent) of those who needed it.

TABLE 12

ENROLLEE CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT, CO-OP STAFF REPORTS
CO-OP STUDY SAMPLE (N=127)

Characteristic	Percent
Below below-midpoint impression ratings:[a]	
Appearance:	
Dress (inappropriate-appropriate)	13%
Cleanliness (dirty-clean)	3
Neatness (unkempt-neat)	17
Posture (poor-good)	7
Healthiness (unhealthy-healthy)	2
Poise (awkward-poised)	9
Speech:	
Clarity (mumbles-speaks clearly)	17
Fluency (halting-fluent)	15
Correctness (ungrammatical-grammatical)	10
Voice (unpleasant-pleasant)	3
Attitude:	
Friendly (hostile-friendly)	6
Interested (apathetic-interested)	6
Confident (timid-confident)	16
Enrollee's occupational goal "reasonable"	95
Needed medical or dental attention	57

[a] Rated "1" or "2" on a 5-point scale defined by polar adjectives. For example, in dress, the scale runs from "1" (inappropriate) to "5" (appropriate) and 13 percent of the subjects were rated "1" or "2".

Summary

Co-Op subjects averaged a reading grade level of 8.4 and an arithmetic grade level of 6.8. These performance levels of academic skills indicated the extent of remedial education needs; and, compared to average school grade completed (11.1), they indicated that school grades tend to overestimate academic achievement. Most Co-Op subjects had some clerical preparation and most of this preparation had occurred in high school. None of the Co-Op subjects had achieved a satisfactory adjustment to the world of work, however, and more than half had never held a job of 30 days or more. From 10 to 17 percent of the Co-Op subjects impressed Beginning Interviewers as being seriously deficient in appearance (appropriateness of dress, cleanliness, and poise) and in speech (clarity, fluency, and correctness). These measures indicated employability needs in academic and job skills and in habits of work.

Employability needs in the area of work-relevant attitudes could be inferred to some extent from the impressions made by the Co-Op subjects at the time of enrollment. Sixteen percent of the subjects, for example, appeared to be seriously lacking in confidence and some of the observed speech difficulties might stem from the same source. All of the Co-Op subjects named clerical occupational goals and were presumably motivated to succeed in the Co-Op and in clerical employment. The strength of this motivation probably varied. In general, then, the extent and character of work-relevant attitudes were not measurable from enrollment information. The flexibility of the Co-Op program, particularly its counseling component, might be expected to provide responses to needs in attitudinal areas that might become apparent in the course of Co-Op experience.

Although the Co-Op was selective, Co-Op subjects were essentially similar to regular NYC enrollees in the matters of welfare assistance, police contact, school grade completed, and number of children.

V

The Co-Op Experience--Program Data

The design of the Co-Op study provided for the collection of program information by members of the Co-Op staff for each enrollee as she (or he) went through the program. This information was collected on the Termination Interview form (Co-Op II).[1] The Termination Interview also contained a number of ratings by Co-Op staff concerning program emphases, apparent effect, and the impressions produced by the enrollee at the time of termination. The work experience component of the program was also reflected in work supervisor evaluations of the enrollees' performances in work assignments. This chapter reports the Co-Op experience as described in these records.

Length of Enrollment

Co-Op subjects averaged 6.8 months in the program (see Table 13) and three-fourths of them were in the program nine months or less. Approximately two-fifths of the Co-Op subjects had NYC experience prior to enrolling in Co-Op, but this preliminary work training did not apparently shorten the time spent in Co-Op. Indeed, the few subjects who had been in the NYC more than a year tended to have longer than average enrollments in the Co-Op.

The average subject with prior NYC experience had spent 5.9 months in the NYC and 6.7 months in the Co-Op for a total NYC enrollment of 12.6 months. The average subject without prior NYC experience had spent 6.9 months in exclusively Co-Op training.

[1] A copy of this form is attached as Appendix B.

TABLE 13

NYC EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO CO-OP, AND MEAN MONTHS IN CO-OP

NYC Experience	Number	Percent	Months in Co-Op
			Mean
None	77	61%	6.9
6 months or less	34	27	6.7
7-12 months	9	7	6.6
More than a year	6	5	9.3
No report	1	--	---
Total	127	100%	6.8

Classroom and Work Experience

As planned, the Co-Op program repeated cycles of classroom work at the NYC Education Center and of work experience in offices until the enrollee was ready for placement in a regular clerical job. These cycles typically covered six weeks at the beginning of the program, but became extended to two months (one month in classroom work and one month in work experience) as the program developed. It was anticipated, when the program was planned, that employability could be achieved in six months, on the average, or that--in other words--from three to four work experiences would be involved.

In practice, 15 percent of the Co-Op subjects were not sent out on job assignments (see Table 14). Most of these subjects were employable after having brushed up their clerical skills in the Education Center. More than half (52 percent) of the subjects having work experience had one or two such experiences, and the mean number of work experiences was 2.2.

When the Co-Op began, work experience was gained in NYC agency worksites; but, as the program developed, cooperating firms in Cincinnati came to provide the program's work experience. Slightly more than half of the Co-Op subjects went through the program in its exclusively NYC phase, and nearly one-third went through the program when it was exclusively a business Co-Op (see Table 15).

TABLE 14

NUMBER OF WORK EXPERIENCES

Experiences	Number	Percent
None (classwork only)	19	15%
One	42	33
Two	28	22
Three	19	15
Four	12	10
Five, or more	6	55
No report	1	--
Total	127	100%

TABLE 15

NYC AND BUSINESS WORK EXPERIENCE

Experience	Number	Percent
NYC agencies only	53	51%
Business only	34	32
NYC and Business	18	17
No work experience (classroom only)	19	--
No report	3	--
Total	127	100%

The transition to a business co-op had several ramifications that might affect the quality of work experience and the employment effectiveness of the program. One of the principal considerations in the change was the impression that NYC agencies tended to provide unrealistic training in that supervision and work loads were often insufficiently demanding. The placement potential of NYC agencies was also lower than that of private firms. With the change to businesses as sites of work experience, the original idea of varied experience as a desideratum was replaced with the idea of repeated assignments to the same site whenever possible. These changes resulted in the Co-Op's being, in many instances, a variety of On-the-Job training, with the enrollee working, during her Co-Op enrollment, as an apprentice in the firm that would ultimately hire her. To some extent, higher performance demands went with the increased placement potential with the result that longer preparation in the Education Center prior to work assignment was occasionally necessary.

An incidental effect of change to businesses as sites of Co-Op work experience was a decrease in the amount of evaluation information. The reporting form for supervisors' evaluations was shortened in connection with the change; but, even so, the completion rate left much to be desired.

The Co-Op utilized instructional resources in the city, as well as the NYC Education Center, in providing enrollees with opportunities to improve their clerical skills. Keypunch instruction and practice, for example, were secured outside the Education Center.

Co-Op Classroom Experience

Five Co-Op subjects spent no time in the NYC Education Center, being referred directly to work experience and not subsequently returning for practice or instruction. The emphases of Co-Op classroom experience are indicated by the average number of hours spent by the rest of the Co-Op subjects in various areas of practice and instruction (see Table 16). Typing received the greatest emphasis with enrollees spending, on the average, 195 hours in typing practice. Of next and almost equal importance were exercises in the use of proper English (109 hours) and practice in office work (105 hours). Comparatively little time was spent by the average enrollee in learning to use other office machines and equipment (33 hours), partly, perhaps, because the Center was limited in such equipment.

Behavioral and school skills were strongly emphasized, accounting for 247 hours, on the average. Clerical performance skills, however, were even more strongly emphasized, accounting for 333 hours, on the average.

Classroom Experience Outside of Co-Op

Eleven Co-Op subjects received keypunch instruction through an arrangement with the Internal Revenue Service. Some of these subjects had begun their keypunch course while in the NYC, prior to enrolling in Co-Op.

TABLE 16

AREAS OF PRACTICE AND INSTRUCTION--CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE
CO-OP STUDY, N=122[a]

Areas	Percent Reporting	Mean Hours
Typing practice	98%	195
Office work, filing, record-keeping	96	105
Use of office equipment	92	33
Exercise in arithmetic	85	78
Exercise in use of proper English	97	109
Work manners and work habits	98	26
Social job etiquette	95	18
Grooming	96	16

[a] Five subjects did not go through the classroom part of the Co-Op training cycle, being referred directly to work experience and not returning to Education Center.

Co-Op Work Experience

Nineteen Co-Op subjects did not go through the work experience phase of the Co-Op training cycle, being placed directly from the initial classroom phase of the cycle. As in classroom experience, typing accounted for the lion's share of work experience time with subjects averaging 119 hours (see Table 17). Filing (75 hours) was of next importance,'followed by record-keeping (33 hours).

The work experience reports of time spent in the various areas of clerical performance were generally less complete than classroom experience reports. Making allowances for some under-reporting, however, the indications are that the work experience phase of the Co-Op training cycle tended to be shorter than the classroom phase. On the basis of total mean hours spent in work experience (368) and of a 40-hour week, Co-Op subjects spent roughly 2.1 months in work experience, on the average. On the basis of a 32-hour (NYC) week and total mean hours in classroom work (580), plus counseling hours (33--see Table 19), Co-Op subjects spent roughly 4.5 months in classroom experience. Since the Co-Op experience, composed of these two phases (initially planned to be equal in length), averaged 6.8 months, some under-reporting is involved--most likely in the work experience phase. Even if all the under-reporting were assigned to work experience, this phase would still be shorter, on the average, than the classroom phase.

TABLE 17

CLERICAL SKILLS PRACTICED--WORK EXPERIENCE
CO-OP STUDY, N=108[a]

Skills	Percent Reporting	Mean Hours
Typing	87%	119
Filing	86	75
Telephone answering	85	23
Message taking	85	18
Mailing	80	16
Record keeping	79	33
Mimeographing	68	23
Stencil cutting	67	17
Other office machines	60	20
Transcribing	41	24

[a] Nineteen subjects did not go through the work experience part of the Co-Op training cycle, being referred to jobs from the Education Center.

It is possible that, as the Co-Op utilized cooperating businesses as sites of work experience, higher skill standards of assignment became operative. Increased qualifications for work assignments, in other words, may have increased the amount of classroom work required by the Co-Op training cycle.

Co-Op Counseling

Co-Op subjects received, on the average, 14 hours of group counseling and 18 hours of individual counseling (see Table 18). General areas of job behavior (dress, grooming, and etiquette) were ordinarily handled in group sessions. The enrollee's personal problems, both in Co-Op and in her home, received attention in individual counseling sessions.

The Termination Interview asked for summary descriptions of areas of personal counsel in terms of least/most counseling time given to them. There were considerable percentages of "no report" in these counseling time ratings, and it is probable that "no report" represented "not applicable" in many instances.[1] Both on the basis of percentage reporting and of mean counseling time reported, family and domestic troubles, and poor personal health were the areas getting the most counseling attention (see Table 19).

Improvements During Co-Op Enrollment

Several measures in the Termination Interview indicated areas of program effect at the time Co-Op subjects left the program. These measures, described below, varied in usefulness; and all of them, of course, were based on performance during enrollment and could not reflect the post-program period. Measures such as these summarize the staff's evaluation of the enrollee's progress and their impressions of the enrollee at the time of termination.

---

[1] The form provided a scale running from "0" (least time) to "4" (most time). Consequently, "no time" was not specifically provided for and may have contributed to the number of "no reports."

TABLE 18

MEAN HOURS OF COUNSELING
CO-OP STUDY (N=127)[a]

Counseling	Mean Hours
Individual counseling:	
Initiated by counselor	11.8
Initiated by enrollee	6.0
Group counseling	14.0

[a] Means are based on hours reported for 91 percent of subjects.

TABLE 19

RELATIVE EMPHASES IN AREAS OF PERSONAL COUNSEL
CO-OP STUDY (N=127)

Area	Percent Reporting	Mean Emphasis[a]
Poor physical health	65%	1.9
Poor emotional health	30	1.5
Low mentality, high aspirations	29	1.0
High mentality, low aspirations	39	1.7
Poor concept of self	44	1.8
Family and domestic troubles	68	2.4
Poor appearance	43	1.9
Lack of progress	49	2.2

[a] Based on rating scale running from "0" (least counseling time) to "4" (most counseling time).

Areas of Improvement

At the time of termination from Co-Op, the Interviewer was asked to rate the enrollee on five-point scales in various areas. The Interviewer, a member of the Co-Op staff, could be presumed to have observed the enrollee to some extent during her Co-Op experience. Average ratings ranged from 3.52 (overall improvement in attitude towards society) to 3.96 (improved relationship to counselor) (see Table 20).

TABLE 20

AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT DURING CO-OP ENROLLMENT
CO-OP STUDY (N=127)[a]

Areas	Mean Improvement[b]
Relationship with other enrollees	3.56
Relationship with counselor	3.96
Attitude towards authority	3.91
Attitude towards society	3.52
Attitude towards work	3.88
Attitude towards the Co-Op program	3.92
Attitude towards self	3.84
Overall improvement in employability	3.54

[a] Eight percent not reported.

[b] Means based on a scale running from "1" (negative--no improvement) to "5" (positive--greatest improvement).

Comparison of Interviewer Impressions on Enrollment and on Termination

Interviewers rated the Co-Op subjects in the same scaled areas of appearance, speech and attitude at the beginning and end of their enrollment. Compared to ratings at time of entry, termination ratings showed very significant improvement in nine of the thirteen areas, and significant improvement in another area (see Table 21). The average ratings in all areas were higher on termination than on enrollment.

The significant improvements in appearance, speech, and confidence indicated that the classroom and counseling aspects of the Co-Op experience, in particular, had an appreciable effect on Co-Op subjects. The value of instruction and counsel in these matters was doubtless reinforced in work experience.

Work Supervisor Evaluations

As planned, work supervisors were to report on the enrollee's performance at the end of each work assignment, and copies of these reports were to be available for each enrollee. In practice, as the Co-Op developed, the two-page supervisor "Evaluations" were shortened to one-page "Progress Reports" (with some attendant difficulty in securing comparable information) and were entirely lacking for a little more than two-fifths of the Co-Op subjects; 19 subjects did not go through the work experience phase of the Co-Op training cycle, and thus would not have supervisor reports, and supervisor evaluations were not available for 35 subjects who were known to have had at least one work experience. Although supervisor evaluation information was not as extensive as had been anticipated, it indicated substantial improvement in some employability areas.

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF INTERVIEWER IMPRESSIONS ON ENROLLMENT AND ON TERMINATION CO-OP STUDY (N=127)

Impression	Enrollment Mean[a]	Termination Mean[a]	CL[b]
Appearance:			
Dress (inappropriate-appropriate)	3.49	4.02	***
Cleanliness (dirty-clean)	3.80	4.26	***
Neatness (unkempt-neat)	3.56	4.13	***
Posture (poor-good)	3.58	3.88	***
Healthiness (unhealthy-healthy)	3.87	3.98	ns
Poise (awkward-poised)	3.60	3.88	***
Speech:			
Clarity (mumbles-speaks clearly)	3.43	3.86	***
Fluency (halting-fluent)	3.40	3.80	***
Correctness (ungrammatical-good grammar)	3.37	3.61	***
Voice (unpleasant-pleasant)	3.62	3.85	**
Attitude:			
Friendliness (hostile-friendly)	3.86	3.95	ns
Interest (apathetic-interested)	3.80	3.90	ns
Confidence (timid-confident)	3.47	3.80	***

[a] Means based on five-point scales defined by polar adjectives. For example, in first scale, values run from "1" (inappropriate dress) to "5" (appropriate dress).

[b] CL=Confidence Level, as follows: ** indicates "significant" (.05 to .01); *** indicates "very significant" (.01 or under); "ns" indicates "not significant" (CL greater than .05 and difference should be attributed to chance).

Supervisor evaluations at the end of the first work assignment showed salient employability problems in several areas. Three-fifths of the Co-Op subjects involved were rated below-average in punctuality, 45 percent, in attendance, and 31 percent in ability to learn (see Table 22). About half of the enrollees with first work assignment evaluations were hired before completing a second work assignment. Comparison of final work assignment evaluations (of enrollees with two or more assignments) with first work assignment evaluations showed a very significant decrease in the percentage of enrollees who were rated below-average in attendance. A significant decrease also was evident in the percentage rated below-average in quality of work. While decreased in below-average percentages in job attitude and ability to learn did not quite reach levels of significance, they were noteworthy.

Termination Testing

The Co-Op's plans to test enrollees on enrollment and on termination were imcompletely realized, particularly in termination testing. Depending on the test, between 27 and 38 Co-Op subjects had complete enrollment and termination test scores. They had raised their reading and arithmetic grade levels .4 grades, on the average and had increased their average General Clerical Skills percentile from 37.5 to 51.9 (see Table 23).

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF "BELOW-AVERAGE"[a] WORK SUPERVISOR EVALUATIONS FIRST AND LAST WORK ASSIGNMENTS

Evaluations	Percent Below-Average First Assignment (N=73)	 Last Assignment (N=37)	CL[b]
Ability to learn	31%	14%	*
Quality of work	20	5	**
Job attitute	26	11	*
Punctuality	60	14	***
Attendance	45	39	ns

[a] Ratings of "1" or "2" in five-point scales defined by polar adjectives in Ability to Learn, Quality of Work and Job Attitude; AND IN five-point scales in "Evaluations" of Punctuality and Attendance and "irregular without satisfactory reason" in "Progress Reports" of Punctuality and Attendance.

[b] * Noticed percentage difference (CL between .10 and .05)
** Significant percentage difference (CL between .05 and .01)
*** Very significant percentage difference (CL less than .01)

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF ENROLLMENT AND TERMINATION TEST RESULTS

Test	Number Twice-Tested	Enrollment Results	Termination Results
	(number)	Mean	Mean
Reading grade level	(38)	8.3	8.7
Arithmetic grade level	(29)	6.8	7.2
General Clerical Skills percentile	(27)	37.5	51.9

Summary

The length of Co-Op experience was just under seven months, on the average, regardless of whether Co-Op subjects had prior work-training in the standard NYC program. Co-Op program developments, in terms of the initial Co-Op plan, included a shift to work experience in private business offices and a lengthening, on the average, of the classroom phase of the training cycle. Aspects of employability emphasized in classroom work were vocational and academic skills and attitude and behaviors appropriate to the world of work.

VI

Experience After Co-Op

Beginning in May, 1968, questionnaires were mailed to enrollees in the Co-Op study with letters requesting their cooperation and offering to pay $1.50 for the return of each completed questionnaire.[1] These self-report forms were designed to provide information concerning the post-program experience of enrollees in the Co-Op study and to get the enrollees' views of the Co-Op program. With the exception of Co-Op study subjects who were also subjects in Retrospective or Prospective study groups, non-respondents to the first mailing received a second request in June, and non-respondents to the second mailing received a third request in July. Completed Retrospective and Prospective interviews supplied comparable follow-up information for some Co-Op subjects. Interviewers were also used to secure follow-up information from non-respondents to the third mailed request. With these subjects interviewers used the Enrollee Questionnaire form. These combined techniques produced a follow-up information completion rate of 97 percent.

Most of the follow-up information in the Co-Op study had been obtained by October, 1968. As of August 1, 1968--the midpoint in follow-up process--the average age of Co-Op subjects was 21.2 years. This chapter reports the post-Co-Op experience of these young adults, particularly as it related to the employment sequels of the program.

Months out of Co-Op

At the time follow-up information was obtained, seven Co-Op subjects were in the program--six had not yet terminated, and one had re-enrolled in the

---

[1] The Enrollee Questionnaire is attached as Appendix E.

Co-Op. The rest of the Co-Op subjects had been out of the program 11.5 months, on the average.

Labor Market Status at the Time of Follow-Up

Counting the enrollees in Co-Op, 86 percent of the subjects in the Co-Op study were in the civilian labor force at the time of follow-up (see Table 24). Most of the Co-Op subjects (58 percent) reported full-time post-Co-Op employment, but 18 percent of them were not working, and four percent reported part-time employment. Five employed Co-Opers--two with full-time employment, and three with part-time jobs--were also in school, working to complete their high school educations.

Although indicating that they were not actively in the labor force at the time of follow-up, the activities of 10 percent of the Co-Op subjects had strong implications of labor force involvement. Four percent, not working or looking for work, were in school. These subjects were completing their high school educations; and, like the subjects (two percent) who were in the Job Corps or an MDTA training program, were engaged in activities that would enhance their employability. In addition, four percent of the Co-Op subjects considered themselves to be only temporarily out of the labor force due to pregnancy.

Compared to labor force status at the time of enrollment, when all of the Co-Op subjects had been unemployed, and 56 percent had never had jobs lasting 30 days or more, the activities of Co-Op subjects at the time of follow-up thus offer strong presumptive evidence that the Co-Op program had very significantly enhanced the employability of its enrollees. Not only were three-fifths of these young people fully-employed, but 11 percent were continuing to improve their employability through additional schooling or training. Except for the three Co-Op subjects involved with the Job Corps or MDTA training programs, the Co-Op program was apparently the final occupational preparation of these young people for the world of work.

TABLE 24

LABOR MARKET STATUS AT TIME OF FOLLOW-UP

Activity	Number	Percent
In Civilain Labor Force:		
In Co-Op	7	6%
Employed full-time:		
Housewife	17	14
Other	54	44
Employed part-time:		
Housewife	3	2
Other	3	2
Unemployed, wanting work:		
Housewife	10	8
Other	12	10
Sub-total, civilian labor force	106	86%
Not in Labor Force:		
Housewife only	3	2
In school	5	4
In MDTA or Job Corps	3	2
Temporarily not working (pregnant)	5	4
Other	1	1
Sub-total, not in labor force	17	14%[a]
No report	4	--
TOTAL	127	100%

[a] Rounding error in sub-categories corrected.

Housewives and the Labor Market

At the time of follow-up, two percent of the Co-Op subjects reported themselves to be outside the labor force by virtue of being "housewives". The Enrollee Questionnaire did not ask for information concerning the subject's family circumstances, but it did provide "housewife" options for reporting activity at the time of follow-up. In all, 28 percent of the Co-Op subjects classified themselves as "housewives;" and, 26 percent were housewives in the labor force. Self-reported housewife status thus was not an appreciable factor in post-Co-Op non-employment.

Employment after Co-Op

Eighty-nine percent of the Co-Op subjects reporting had some post-Co-Op employment (see Table 25). The incidence of reported employment in the period after Co-Op thus corresponded quite closely to that of subjects in the labor force at the time of follow-up (86 percent). The difference between some employment in the entire period (89 percent) and employment at the time of follow-up (60 percent) was made up of subjects who, at the time of follow-up were unemployed or who had moved out of the labor force, at least for the time being.

In the post-Co-Op period, subjects averaged 8.2 months of employment in jobs that paid, on the average, $1.75 an hour. Most (57 percent) of the Co-Op subjects had held only one job in this period.

Considering current (employed at time of follow-up) and most recent (unemployed at time of follow-up, but some employment in post-Co-Op period) jobs, 83 percent of the Co-Op subjects had held clerical jobs (see Table 26). Most frequently (54 percent), these jobs had been secured through the Co-Op or the NYC (see Table 27). The second most frequently mentioned job source was friends or relatives (22 percent).

TABLE 25

NUMBER OF JOBS AFTER CO-OP

Number of Jobs		Number	Percent
None		13	11%
One		66	57
Two		24	21
Three		13	11
Still in Co-Op		6	--
No report		5	--
	Total	127	100%

TABLE 26

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB

Description		Number	Percent
Clerical:			
Office		62	61%
Machine		17	17
Other		5	5
Non-clerical		17	17
Still in Co-Op		6	--
Terminated, no job after Co-Op		13	--
No report		5	--
	Total	127	100%

TABLE 27

REFERRAL TO CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB
"How did you hear about this job?"

Referral	Number	Percent
Co-Op or NYC staff	56	54%
Friends or relatives	23	22
Public Employment Service	4	4
Private employment agency	1	1
Previous employer	1	1
Advertisements	8	8
Own efforts	8	8
Other (Urban League)	2	2
Still in Co-Op	6	--
Terminated, no job after Co-Op	13	--
No report	5	--
Total	127	100%

Subjects who were unemployed at the time of follow-up but who had at least one job in the post-Co-Op period were asked to report the main reason why they were no longer working. This question applied to relatively few subjects Responses to it indicated that pregnancy was a major reason for terminated employment (see Table 28). One-fourth of the respondents to this question reported that their jobs had ended, indicating that the job itself, rather than the respondent's performance, was at fault. Several respondents had moved out of the labor force to school or training programs, and only one respondent reported that she had been fired. Counted as "other" were such miscellaneous quitting reasons as "baby wasn't old enough," "couldn't get along with boss's daughter," and "prejudice of new manager." Although information in this area was not extensive, reasons for terminated employment indicated the principal problems that enrollees faced in achieving satisfactory adjustments to the world of work: namely, restricted availability due to children, poor-quality jobs, and the need to improve employability in terms of occupational preparation and behavioral skills.

TABLE 28

MAIN REASON NO LONGER HAVE JOB

Reason		Number	Percent
Pregnancy		8	30%
Ill-health		1	4
Job ended		7	26
Was fired		1	4
School or training program		3	11
Moved		2	7
Other		5	19
No reason because:			
Never left Co-Op		6	--
Never had job after Co-Op		13	--
Have job (employed at follow-up)		77	--
No report		4	--
	Total	127	101%

Labor Force Status and Employment after Co-Op

Co-Op subjects reporting full-time employment at the time of follow-up averaged 11.5 months out of the program and 1.5 months of unemployment (see Table 29). Other subjects in the labor force averaged slightly less time out of the program, but very much more unemployment. The employment adjustments indicated by labor force status at the time of follow-up, were thus broadly indicative of adjustments in the post-program period.

Compared to subjects with one month, or more, of unemployment in the period following Co-Op, subjects with continuous employment were very significantly more apt to have held a single job, and they were very significantly more apt to have found employment through Co-Op or the NYC (see Table 30). Subjects unemployed at the time of follow-up, but having held at least one job in the post-period after Co-Op, described job referrals to their most recent employment. Some of the referrals of subjects with unemployment, therefore, describe placements that didn't last. On the other hand, one of Co-Op's objectives was to improve the job-finding behaviors of enrollees and it is possible that the program was a factor in some "other" referrals (Employment Service, Advertisements, Own efforts, and the like). The ability of Co-Op enrollees to find jobs on their own clearly becomes more important as these young people move on to the second and third jobs after Co-Op.

TABLE 29

SUBJECTS IN THE LABOR FORCE AT THE TIME OF FOLLOW-UP, LABOR FORCE STATUS, MONTHS OUT OF CO-OP AND EMPLOYMENT

Labor Force Status	Number	Months Since Co-Op	Months Unemployed
		Mean	Mean
Employed full-time	71	11.5	1.5
Employed part-time	6	10.8	5.4
Unemployed, wanting work	22	10.6	6.0
Not applicable, in Co-Op	7	--	--
Total	106	11.2	2.7

TABLE 30

SUBJECTS IN THE LABOR FORCE AT THE TIME OF FOLLOW-UP, EMPLOYMENT AFTER CO-OP, NUMBER OF JOBS AND REFERRAL TO MOST RECENT JOB

		No Unemployment[a] (N=65)	Some Unemployment (N=41)
		Percent	Percent
Number of jobs:			
No jobs after Co-Op		9%[b]	32%
One		68	32
Two or three		23	37
	Total	100%	101%
Job referral:			
No jobs after Co-Op		9%	32%
Co-Op or NYC		62	27
Friends or relatives		15	20
Other		14	22
	Total	100%	101%

[a] Defined as continuous employment or less than one month of unemployment.

[b] Six subjects were still actively enrolled in Co-Op at the time of follow-up.

Employer Reports of Employment after Co-Op

In the course of follow-up, Co-Op subjects were asked to give the name and address of their most recent employer--their current employer if they were employed at the time of follow-up, or their most recent employer if they were unemployed, but had had some post-Co-Op employment. As each employer was identified, a short Employer Work Performance form[1] was mailed to him with the request that he describe the subject's job and performance. Second requests and telephoned reminders in addition to the initial request achieved a completion rate of 100 percent in this aspect of follow-up information.

---

[1] A copy of the Employer Work Performance form is attahced as Appendix F.

Employers' descriptions of the kind of work done by Co-Op subjects was closely similar to those provided by the subjects themselves (see Table 31). Most (85 percent) of the post-Co-Op jobs were clerical, and most of the clerical jobs involved general office work. Nineteen percent of the employer-reported jobs were primarily machine-clerical and involved the operation of such machines as keypunches and teletypes.

TABLE 31

DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB, EMPLOYER REPORTS

Description	Number	Percent
Employer Reports		
Clerical:		
Office	61	62%
Machine	19	19
Other	3	3
Non-clerical	15	15
No report	6	--
Sub-total, employer reports	104	99%
No Employer Reports		
Still in Co-Op	6	--
No job reported after Co-Op	13	--
Employer not identified	4	--
Sub-total, no employer reports	23	--
Total	127	99%

Employer reports were later than enrollee follow-ups and thus update the latter to some extent. The average hourly rate of pay reported by employers, for example, was $1.82--or seven cents more, on the average, than that reported for the same jobs by enrollees. This difference may have been due to pay increases subsequent to the time of enrollee follow-up. On the other hand, employer reports indicated that some of the enrollees reporting employment had subsequently been terminated from their jobs.

Reasons for termination were reported for a little more than one-third of the jobs figuring in employer reports (see Table 32). These reasons paralleled those given by enrollees in some respects. Poor jobs ("job ended") accounted for about the same number of terminations, and pregnancy continued to be an appreciable factor in termination. Relatively more of the employer-reported terminations, however, connoted poor adjustment to the world of work. Employers reported that seven subjects had been fired, and that twelve had "quit." Only one enrollee reported that she had been fired; and, although some of the employer-reported firings may have occurred after the time of enrollee follow-up, it seems likely that some of the enrollees' "other" reasons for termination may, in fact, have been firings. The enrollees whom employers reported to have "quit" obviously included some enrollees who had returned to school or entered training programs. The difference between employer and enrollee follow-ups in reasons for termination suggested more widespread difficulties in adjusting to the world of work than were reflected in enrollee follow-ups.

TABLE 32

TERMINATIONS AND REASONS FOR TERMINATION, EMPLOYER REPORTS

Terminations and Reasons	Number	Percent
Terminated because:		
Pregnancy	5	5%
Ill-health	1	1
Job ended	8	8
Poor work (fired)	7	7
Quit	12	12
Moved	2	2
Sub-total, terminated	35	35%
Not terminated	62	64
No report	7	--
Total	104	99%

Employers rated most (81 percent) of the Co-Op subjects as average or above in overall job performance (see Table 33). Only seven percent were rated as "entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising" and 12 percent were rated as "unsatisfactory but showed signs of improvement." For those subjects who had secured post-program employment, then, most had achieved at least average levels of competence. At the same time, a few were still critically in need of training and placement help.

TABLE 33

RATINGS OF OVERALL JOB PERFORMANCE, EMPLOYER REPORTS

Rating	Number	Percent
1 Entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising	7	7%
2 Unsatisfactory, showed signs of improvement	11	12
3 About average	36	38
4 Average to good	35	37
5 Outstanding	6	6
No report	7	--
Total	104	100%

Employers also rated Co-Op subjects in various areas of job performance (see Table 34). In each of these areas, most of the Co-Op subjects were average or above average, the proportions running from 76 percent (attendance) to 94 percent (relationship with other workers). The three highest proportions of average and above ratings--relationship with other workers, appearance, and quality of work--indicate, perhaps, the strongest inputs of the Co-Op program.

Many of the employers involved in the Co-Op study commented very favorably on the value of the Co-Op program and quality of Co-Op employees. One of these employers, a firm with headquarters in Cincinnati and district offices in a number of southern and eastern cities, returned the follow-up data with the following appreciation of the Co-Op program:

> We have been working with the Neighborhood Youth Corps for approximately one and one-half years on a cooperative work study program for clerical employees. The program consists of alternating one month study periods in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in which the trainees learn typing, business English, arithmetic, business machines, etc., and one month work periods with the ____________ Company where the trainees do typing and miscellaneous clerical work. The program lasts for a total of six months, with three months being spent in the Neighborhood Youth Corps School Program and three months working for our firm. We have found this to be a most successful program and have hired five girls from the Neighborhood Youth Corps as permanent employees in our firm. Without exception, these girls have proven to be successful, promotable employees.

> We feel the interesting aspect of this to be that these girls when they first come to us, neither have the skills or poise to properly adapt to an office atmosphere; however, after six months of this Co-Op program they are at a level of any normal employee that we would hire on to our work force.
>
> It is my opinion and I know that of our company, that this is a vital program and every effort should be made to continue it in our community. If there is further information regarding this that would be helpful to you, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Comments such as these, although not quantifiable, strongly suggest Co-Op effectiveness.

TABLE 34

PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDE RATINGS, EMPLOYER REPORTS

Performance and Attitude	Number Reporting	Average and Above[a]	Mean[b]
	(number)	Percent	Mean
Overall Performance (unsatisfactory-outstanding	(97)	81%	3.07
Punctuality	(96)	79	3.50
Attendance	(95)	76	3.25
Attitude to work	(94)	80	3.41
Speed of learning	(95)	81	3.25
Quality of work	(94)	84	3.24
Quantity of work	(93)	80	3.22
Relationship with others	(95)	94	3.83
Attitude towards authority	(95)	80	3.87
Appearance	(95)	90	4.19

[a] Rated "3," "4" or "5" on five-point scale described by polar adjectives.

[b] Mean of ratings on scale running from "1" (least) to "5" (most). For example, in Punctuality, scale runs from "1" (never on time) to "5" (never late).

Employment Effectiveness

The follow-up data reported in this chapter have indicated a considerable degree of program effectiveness in terms of post-Co-Op employment. Two aspects of these data--incidence of employment at the time of follow-up and continuity of employment--provided good general indicators of adjustment to the world of work. In order to evaluate the employment effectiveness of the Co-Op program, Co-Op subjects who had been out of the program at least six months were compared with a Control group composed of young women in Cincinnati, also interviewed in the summer and fall of 1968, who had no NYC or Co-Op experience. The Control group matched the Co-Op Experimental group in terms of race, sex and school grade completed; but, was, on the average, about a year older.

Subjects in the two groups were dichotomized on the basis of employment at the time of follow-up and of employment in the six preceding months. Those employed at the time of follow-up and continuously employed in the preceding six months were placed in the "good" category; and, those discontinuously employed in the preceding six months, whether or not employed at the time of follow-up, were placed in the "fair or poor" category.

Very significantly more of the Co-Op subjects (75 percent) than of the Control subjects (49 percent) had good adjustments to the world of work (see Table 35). The fact that the Control group was older emphasizes the significance of this finding, since we have found with this population that there is a positive correlation between age and employment. It should also be noted that the interview completion rate for the Co-Op sample was 97 percent as compared to 60-70 percent for the Control group. There are some indications that non-interviewed subjects are less likely to be employed than interviewed subjects. Interviewers, for example, often report that subjects with poor employment adjustments are hard to locate. To the extent that the interviewed Control subjects over-reflected good employment adjustments, the comparison may have under-reflected the actual employment advantages of Co-Op subjects.

TABLE 35

WORK ADJUSTMENT, CO-OP SUBJECTS AND CONTROL GROUP

Quality of Employment	Co-Op Subjects (N=80)	Control Group (N=35)
	Percent	
Good[a]	75%	49%
Fair or poor[b]	25	51
Total	100%	100%

[a] Continuously employed in six months preceding follow-up.

[b] Unemployed some or all of the time in six months preceding follow-up.

Comparisons between "Successful" and "Unsuccessful" Co-Op Subjects

On the basis of follow-up information supplied by subjects and their employers, the Co-Op subjects were categorized as "successful" or "unsuccessful" in their adjustments to the world of work. In this comparison, "successful" adjustment to the world of work was rigorously defined to consist of (1) full-time employment in a clerical job at the time of follow-up, and (2) employers' ratings of "4" (average to good) or "5" (outstanding). "Unsuccessful" adjustment was defined as (1) unemployed and wanting work at the time of follow-up, and (2) employers' ratings of "1" (entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising). In these terms, 19 Co-Op subjects had made "successful" adjustments, and 29 had been "unsuccessful."

As of August 1, 1968, "successful" Co-Op subjects averaged 21.6 years of age (see Table 36). They had completed 11.6 school grades, on the average, and had put in 479 hours, on the average, in work experience. "Unsuccessful" subjects, on the other hand, averaged 19.8 years of age, 11.0 school grades completed, and 286 hours of work experience. The differences between the two groups of Co-Op subjects in these respects were significant at the .05 level of confidence. Compared to "unsuccessful" subjects, "successful" subjects were also significantly more optimistic about achieving their occupational goals. Comparisons of means in other quantified areas of school and program experience--months between leaving school and entering the program, the extent of NYC experience prior to Co-Op, test scores on entering Co-Op, extent and character of classroom work, months in Co-Op, and the amount and character of Co-Op counseling--showed no significant differences between the two groups.

Interviewer impressions of the "successful" and "unsuccessful" groups averaged the same at the time the subjects entered the program but differed significantly at the time of termination with the "successful" group given a significantly higher rating on appropriateness of dress, cleanliness, neatness, posture, healthiness of appearance, and interest. In general, both groups were given a higher rating at the time of termination with the degree of improvement for the "successful" group greater than it was for the "unsuccessful" group.

TABLE 36

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" CO-OP SUBJECTS
MEAN COMPARISONS

Measure of difference	"Successful" (N=19)	"Unsuccessful" (N=26)	CL[a]
		Mean	
Age, August 1, 1968 (years)	21.6	19.8	**
Total hours in work assignments	479	286	**
Highest school grade completed	11.6	11.0	**
Enrollee's estimate goal achievem't.	1.89	2.15	
Interviewer Impressions, Termination Interview:			
Dress	4.47	3.73	***
Cleanliness	4.68	4.12	**
Neatness	4.58	3.85	***
Posture	4.11	3.38	**
Appearance	4.05	3.50	**
Interest	4.21	3.35	***
Improvement Ratings, Termination Interview:			
Overall improvement in employability	3.78	2.76	***
Relationship with other enrollees	3.72	3.20	**
Relationship with counselor	4.22	3.60	**
Attitude towards work	4.33	3.24	***
Attitude towards Co-Op program	4.22	3.64	**
Employer Ratings:			
Punctuality	4.00	3.20	**
Attendance	3.74	2.67	**
Work attitude	4.16	2.36	***
Speed of learning	3.68	2.67	***
Quality of work	3.74	2.47	***
Quantity of work	3.89	2.43	***
Relationship with others	4.32	3.50	**
Attitude towards authority	4.47	3.29	***
Appearance	4.58	3.36	***

[a] ** denotes significance at .05.
*** denotes significance at .01.

Areas of improvement were rated at the time of termination. "Successful" subjects averaged very significantly higher ratings than "unsuccessful" subjects in overall improvement in employability, and in attitude towards work. They also averaged significantly higher ratings in relationships with other enrollees and with counselors and in attitude towards the Co-Op program. There were no significant differences between the two groups in three rated areas: Attitude towards authority, Attitude towards society, and Attitude towards self.

The two groups were also compared on the basis of average employer ratings. In this comparison, "successful" subjects were significantly, or very significantly, higher than "unsuccessful" subjects in all rated areas. Ratings showing very significant differences--work attitude, speed of learning, quality and quantity of work, attitude towards authority, and appearance--indicated, perhaps, the essential elements of successful work adjustment.

In addition to comparing the two groups on the basis of mean measurements, "successful" and "unsuccessful" subjects were reviewed with respect to the incidence of different kinds of experience. Although several percentage differences appeared to be sizeable, only two were significant (see Table 37). Very significantly more of the "successful" subjects reported typing ability on enrollment and very significantly more of them had found their most recent job through Co-Op or NYC. Noticeably more of the "successful" subjects had been in business co-ops while more of the "unsuccessful" subjects had their work experience exclusively in NYC agencies. In other respects--occupational preparation in high school, job experience prior to Co-Op, police contacts, and welfare assistance at the time of enrollment--there were no significant differences between the two groups.

TABLE 37

PERCENTAGE COMPARISONS, "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" CO-OP SUBJECTS

Variable	"Successful" (N=19)	"Unsuccessful" (N=26)	CL[a]
	Percent		
Typing ability at time of enrollment	70%	48%	***
Co-Op/NYC referral to most recent job	90	29	***
Work experience in business Co-Op	56	23	*
Occupational preparation in high school	79	87	ns
Had held job prior to enrollment	37	42	ns
No police contacts prior to enrollment	90	80	ns
Welfare assistance prior to enrollment	32	36	ns

[a] *** denotes significance at .01.
* denotes notice at .10.
ns denotes "not significant".

Summary

The follow-up information reported in this chapter has described employment sequels in Co-Op experience. Comparison of Co-Op subjects with a Control group of young women having had no Co-Op or NYC experience indicated that the Co-Op program was a very significant factor in achieving satisfactory adjustments to the world of work. Comparisons of "successful" and "unsuccessful" Co-Op subjects indicated that some of the most important elements of employability are performance (quality and quantity of work), appearance, work attitudes and social skills. The Co-Op program elements that particularly contributed to improvements in these areas were work experience, particularly in business co-op worksites, and Co-Op job referral.

The material in this chapter, as well as that in the preceding chapters, has consisted of observations of Co-Op subjects to a large extent. In the next chapter, we turn to the subjects themselves. After reporting the enrollees' views of the program and their Co-Op experience, we shall take another look at the "successful"-"unsuccessful" comparison in order to investigate the role of more subtle program inputs in the areas of attitudes and behavioral skills.

VII

Enrollees' Views of Co-Op

Many items in the Enrollee Questionnaire, and parallel parts of the Retrospective and Prospective interview forms, sought information from subjects in the Co-Op study concerning their reactions to the program. These reactions--enrollee reports of liked and disliked parts of Co-Op, usefulness of the program, and the like--are reported in this chapter. In addition to reporting enrollee's views of the program, this chapter reports the occupational goals of the Co-Op subjects at the time of follow-up, and relates both views and goals to program effectiveness.

Subjects in the Co-Op study, particularly those who made use of the Enrollee Questionnaire, contributed many full--and sometimes vivid--views of the program. For example, 70 percent of them accepted the invitation of the final questionnaire items to furnish "other comments," and these comments often covered most of the last page of the form. Unstructured responses such as these, as well as the relatively high rate of self-report, indicated considerable enrollee interest in the Co-Op.

Enrollees' Reasons for Leaving Co-Op

Two-thirds of the Co-Op study subjects who reported their reasons for leaving the program left for employment, and four percent left for other training programs or school (see Table 38). Seven out of ten of the Co-Op exits were thus consonant with the program's employability objectives. Twelve percent of the subjects reported that the program had terminated them or that they had been dissatisfied with the program--reasons that implied some maladjustment to the program. The rest of the subjects gave situational reasons that were unrelated to program objectives or operations. Pregnancy or family problems, the two most frequently reported situational reasons, occasioned the departure of 15 percent of the subjects from the program.

TABLE 38

ENROLLEES' REASONS FOR LEAVING CO-OP

Reasons	Number	Percent
Employment	66	66%
School or training	4	4
Terminated	3	3
Insufficient money	2	2
Dissatisfaction with Co-Op program	5	5
Dissatisfaction with Co-Op staff, facilities	2	2
Pregnancy	9	9
Marriage, family reasons	6	6
Illness	2	2
Moved	2	2
Total	100	100%
No information:		
Still in Co-Op	6	--
Retrospective or Prospective follow-up	17	--
No report	4	--
Total	127	

Six Co-Op subjects were still in the program at the time of follow-up and thus could not respond to this item of the questionnaire. No reports of reasons for leaving the program were possible in the cases of subjects followed-up through Retrospective and Prospective interviews, because the interview forms in these studies did not include this item.

Enrollees' Ratings

Co-Op subjects rated the helpfulness of their counselors and supervisors and the overall usefulness of their Co-Op experience on five-point scales running from "1" (not at all) to "5" (very). These ratings were preponderantly upper-scale: 52 percent of the subjects rating the helpfulness of counselors and supervisors at "5", and 66 percent, rating the usefulness of Co-Op experience at "5" (see Table 39). Compared to supervisor ratings, significantly more counselor ratings were low ("1" or "2"); and compared to both counselor and supervisor ratings, significantly more overall usefulness ratings were extremely high ("5"). Enrollees' ratings thus supported three general impressions of Co-Op operations: (1) most enrollees viewed the program's personnel as very helpful; (2) some enrollees differentiated sharply between the helpfulness of counselors and supervisors; and (3) the high overall usefulness of the program reflected factors additional to the helpfulness of program personnel.

Contexts of enrollee ratings indicated that some supervisor ratings referred to Co-Op supervisors rather than work supervisors. Subjects without work assignments naturally responded within the context of their experience at the Education Center, for example, and the comments of other subjects also sometimes indicated that the supervisors of the Education Center were the subjects of supervisor ratings.

Examples of Counselor and Supervisor Helpfulness

Following their ratings of counselor and supervisor helpfulness, Co-Op subjects provided examples of helpfulness (or lack of helpfulness). Three out of ten subjects gave general examples that substantially reiterated ratings but did not specify a particular kind of help (see Table 40). The frequency of general "examples" was probably occasioned, to some extent, by the difficulty of particularizing fairly complex situations. Even though Co-Op subjects ordinarily had several counselors and supervisors, however, they were able--for the most part--to summarize their experience in single ratings and to illustrate their ratings with fairly specific examples.

TABLE 39

ENROLLEES' RATINGS OF HELPFULNESS OF COUNSELORS AND SUPERVISORS, AND OVERALL USEFULNESS OF CO-OP

Rating	Helpfulness of Counselors (N=127)	Helpfulness of Supervisors (N=127)	Usefulness of Co-Op (N=127)
		Percent	
1 (not at all)	7%	1%	3%
2	4	3	1
3	16	22	10
4	22	23	21
5 (very)	52	52	66
Total	101%	101%	101%
Mean ratings	4.08	4.23	4.47
No report (number)	(5)	(6)	(6)

Help inside Co-Op (principally getting desired work assignments) was of minor (three percent) importance in the examples of both counselor and supervisor help. Help in getting employment, sometimes associated with help in getting work assignments, was described in 13 percent of the counselor-helpfulness and

TABLE 40

ENROLLEES' EXAMPLES OF COUNSELOR AND SUPERVISOR HELPFULNESS

Examples	Number	Percent
Counselors		
Help within the Co-Op program (assignments)	3	3%
Help in getting a job plus, perhaps, help within the Co-Op program	16	13
Help in program areas (training, instruction, counsel)	33	27
General help	36	30
Helpfulness reduced:		
Co-Op conditions (facilities, understaffing)	9	7
Personal qualities, plus, perhaps, conditions (inaccessibility, favortism)	24	20
No report	6	--
Total	127	100%
Supervisors		
Help within the Co-Op program	3	3%
Help in getting a job plus, perhaps, help within the Co-Op program	9	7
Help in program areas	51	42
General help	37	31
Helpfulness reduced:		
Co-Op conditions	6	5
Personal qualities plus, perhaps, Co-Op conditions	15	12
No report	6	--
Total	127	100%

seven percent of the supervisor-helpfulness examples. As we have seen, work assignments often led directly to employment. Examples of these two kinds of help might be taken, therefore, as indications of the enrollees' views of the extent of employment-related help. As such, the practical employment assistance of both counselors and supervisors was seen to be relatively slight (16 percent and 10 percent, respectively).

Significantly more (42 percent) of the examples of supervisor helpfulness than of the examples of counselor helpfulness (27 percent) described help in Co-Op program areas (training, instruction, and counsel). Both supervisors and counselors were thus seen to be most helpful in terms of tasks within the programs, and supervisors were significantly more apt to be helpful than counselors in this respect.

Designated Useful Aspects of Co-Op Experience

The questionnaire and interview item concerning useful aspects of Co-Op experience provided eleven listed options including "nothing useful." In addition, space was provided for "other" useful aspects. Subjects were asked to indicate as many options as applied, and to report the single most useful aspect.

Very pervasive appreciations of the program's usefulness were attested by the facts that (1) 16 percent of the Co-Op subjects indicated that all mentioned aspects were useful and (2) Co-Op subjects averaged 5.9 checks of useful aspects. The most frequently checked useful aspects were: "learning good work habits" (81 percent, "getting job skills" (76 percent), and "continuing education" (61 percent). (See Table 41). The two least frequently mentioned useful aspects were: "earning money" (43 percent), and "having an interesting job " (47 percent).

TABLE 41

ENROLLEES' MENTIONED AND MOST USEFUL ASPECTS OF CO-OP (N=127)[a]

Aspects	Mentioned as Useful	Most Useful
	Percent	
Help in getting a job after Co-Op	58%	3%
Learning to work for a boss	55	9
Learning good work habits	81	10
Getting job skills	76	10
Help from work supervisor	52	9
Help from counselor	54	7
Learning to get along better with other people	56	12
Earning money	43	12
Having an interesting job	47	16
Continuing education	61	12
Nothing useful	2	1
Total	585%[b]	101%

[a] Five subjects not reporting.

[b] Enrollees could mention more than one aspect as useful.

Nine respondents made use of the "other" space and reported the program's usefulness in areas of personal development, general opportunity, and job-finding techniques.

Enrollees' reports of the single most useful aspect of Co-Op experience showed no predominant area of usefulness. "Help from counselor" was least frequently mentioned (seven percent), and "having an interesting job" was most frequently mentioned (16 percent). Four most useful aspects were particularly work-relevant: "help in getting a job," "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," and "getting job skills;" these aspects, together with "continuing education," were reported as most useful by 44 percent of the Co-Op subjects. Those who reported "earning money" or "having an interesting job" (28 percent) apparently thought of the program as an end in itself. In addition, 38 percent of the subjects designated "help from work supervisor," "help from counselor" or "learning to get along better with people," as most useful aspects. Considering all mentioned aspects of program usefulness as well as most useful aspects, enrollees' reports indicated that they placed a higher value on preparation for the world of work than on "earning money" or "having an interesting job."

Enrollees' Descriptions of Most Useful Co-Op Experience

After designating useful aspects of Co-Op experience in the structured information items, Co-Op subjects gave unstructured descriptions of their most useful Co-Op experiences. Most frequently (31 percent), these descriptions pertained to job skills--competencies gained through work assignments (see Table 42). The next largest set of descriptions (20 percent) pertained to classroom work--the acquisition of academic and clerical skills at the Education Center. A little more than half of the respondents thus considered the learning of performance skills as most useful, and work assignments were more frequently associated with this learning than was the Education Center.

TABLE 42

ENROLLEES' DESCRIPTIONS OF MOST USEFUL CO-OP EXPERIENCES

Experiences	Number	Percent
Employment only Specific association of Co-Op with post-Co-Op employment. How to apply for and get a job.	12	10%
Work habits only Job attitudes and behavior. Learning importance of being on time, doing one's best, proper dress.	17	14
Job skills only Work experience and benefits specifically associated with assignments. Skills acquired on assignments, including typing.	37	31
Classroom work only Furthering education. Skill acquisition at Education Center, including typing.	24	20
Personal development only Social skills. No specific association with job skills or performance.	13	11
Compound:		
Employment and work habits	3	3
Work habits and classroom	1	1
Work habits and personal development	2	2
Job skills and classroom	4	3
Job skills and personal development	2	2
All parts of Co-Op experience equally useful	3	3
Nothing useful	1	--
No report	8	--
Total	127	100%

The development of good work habits or personal development generally were considered most useful by about one-fourth of the Co-Op respondents, and about one-tenth of the respondents specifically associated employment with their most useful Co-Op experience.

These unstructured descriptions thus confirmed the impressions produced by enrollees' designations of useful aspects of Co-Op experience. Enrollees viewed the program primarily as a learning experience through which they could prepare for employment, repair their educations, and improve their social skills.

What Enrollees Disliked about Co-Op

Thirty-nine Co-Op subjects--34 percent of those responding--reported that there was nothing they disliked about the program (see Table 43). Most of the reported dislikes were associated with the attitude or character of staff and other enrollees (30 percent), physical conditions at the Education Center (27 percent), or pay and enrollment policies (13 percent). The extent and character of these dislikes indicated that many enrollees considered their Co-Op experience to be less-than-optimum. At the same time, in view of enrollee responses concerning the program's usefulness, it seemed evident that these disliked aspects of Co-Op did not, by and large, seriously impair the usefulness of the program.

More serious were the criticisms (19 percent) in the area of work assignments and employment. Twelve percent of the respondents reported that they "disliked" their post-program employment (or lack of it). These respondents didn't "like" the program because, in their experience, it had not been effective in terms of post-Co-Op employment.

TABLE 43

WHAT ENROLLEES DISLIKED ABOUT CO-OP

Disliked	Number	Percent
Employment and work assignments		
Post-Co-Op jobs poor, delayed, or non-existent	9	12%
Work assignment delayed or did not materialize	3	4
Work assignments poor, not vocationally useful	2	3
Co-Op policies		
Pay	3	4
The "Discipline System," "when you have a baby, you have to start over."	7	9
Co-Op conditions		
Inadequate facilities, staff. Overcrowding	21	27
Co-Op personnel		
Staff. Poor character, attitude, favoritism	11	14
Enrollees. Poor character, attitude, behavior	9	12
General. Staff and enrollees. Dissatisfaction in inter-personal relations.	3	4
General and compound		
Content of Co-Op program	4	5
Remedial education classes	3	4
Co-Op conditions and employment	1	1
Co-Op conditions and policies	1	1
Nothing disliked	39	--
No report	11	--
Total	127	100%

"What Might Make a Person Want to Get into Co-Op?"

Our studies of the NYC have shown that enrollees hear about the program primarily from their friends. The image of the program is thus most often projected by the potential enrollee's peer group. Like other ex-enrollees, the Co-Op subjects were in peer groups that could be expected to influence future enrollments. The information items, "What might make a person want (and/or not want) to get into Co-Op?" investigated the Co-Op image as it might be verbally projected by Co-Op subjects. These items were not included in the Retrospective interview form.

Nine out of ten of the Co-Op respondents stressed the opportunity offered by the program, and 69 percent specified work-relevant opportunity (see Table 44). One-fourth of the respondents also mentioned the fact of paid opportunity ("earn and learn"). Only one respondent indicated that Co-Op training could be considered as an attractive job, and only eight indicated that the enjoyableness of the experience was, in itself, sufficient to attract a person into the program.

"What Might Make a Person Not Want to Get into Co-Op?"

Twenty-nine Co-Op subjects--26 percent of those responding--felt that there was nothing unattractive about the program (see Table 45). The most frequently mentioned (35 percent) possible barrier to Co-Op enrollment was the potential enrollee herself: "if she lacked the character or disposition to work and to learn, she might not want to get into the program." Four percent of the respondents noted that a lack of need, particularly a lack of need for remedial education, might keep a person out of the program.

TABLE 44

ENROLLEES' VIEWS OF "WHAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON WANT TO GET INTO CO-OP"

What	Number	Percent
Employment opportunity (jobs resulting from Co-Op)	22	20%
Vocational training (work experience, learn good work habits and job skills)	30	27
Educational opportunity ("learning" in general and references to academic subjects)	6	5
Vocational and educational	7	6
Vocational and money	18	16
Educational and money	5	4
Co-Op is an enjoyable experience and/or money	8	7
Co-Op is a job	1	1
Opportunity in general ("it opens and paves the way to a brighter future for those who are willing to strive. . .")	16	14
Nothing attractive about Co-Op	1	--
No report (Retrospective study)	6	--
No report	7	--
Total	127	100%

Program drawbacks were primarily associated with the pay (21 percent), inadequate or ineffective vocational preparation (13 percent), the attitude and character of staff or enrollees (12 percent), and poor physical conditions at the Education Center (10 percent).

TABLE 45

ENROLLEES' VIEWS OF "WHAT MIGHT MAKE A PERSON NOT WANT TO GET INTO CO-OP"

What	Number	Percent
"Person's" Characteristics		
Lack of interest, willingness to work, ability to learn to get along with other people.	29	35%
Lack of need for Co-Op training (already through high school and possessing job skills)	3	4
Co-Op Characteristics		
Money (too little)	17	21
Employment (placement delay or failure)	6	7
Vocational preparation ineffective or inadequate	2	2
Worksites (assignment delays and poor worksite experience)	3	4
Education Center (physical conditions)	8	10
Education Center (attitude or character of Co-Op staff)	3	4
Enrollees (attitude or character)	7	8
Money and employment or Education Center	3	3
Employment and enrollee attitudes	1	1
Attitude of Counselors and inadequate equipment	1	1
Nothing unattractive about Co-Op	29	--
No report (Retrospective study)	6	--
No report	9	--
Total	127	100%

Enrollees' Occupational Goals

"Ten years from now" two-thirds of the Co-Op subjects wanted to be doing some kind of clerical work (see Table 46). A little more than one-fifth had non-clerical goals--12 percent desiring professional or semi-professional employment, and 10 percent wanting work as technicians, skilled manual workers, semi-skilled

TABLE 46

ENROLLEES' OCCUPATIONAL GOALS
"WHAT KIND OF WORK WOULD YOU REALLY LIKE TO BE DOING TEN YEARS FROM NOW?"

Goals	Number	Percent
Clerical--office work in areas of Co-Op preparation including: keypunch, and including advanced jobs such as executive or administrative secretary and programming	80	67%
Professional or Semi-Professional (teacher, social worker, counseling)	14	12
Technicians, Skilled Manual, and Machine Operation	6	5
Semi-skilled or Unskilled	6	5
Housewife only	12	10
Don't know	2	2
No report	7	--
Total	127	101%

or unskilled employees. One in ten "really" wanted to be housewives outside the labor force.

Twenty subjects naming clerical goals also named secondary goals--13 at other levels of clerical work, and seven in professional work. Five subjects naming professional goals also named secondary goals--four in other professions, and one in clerical work. Similarly, two subjects with goals of semi-skilled employment also mentioned second possibilities--one, another kind of semi-skilled employment; and the other, housewife. Finally, two subjects who really wanted to be housewives amended their goals--one by writing that she would probably really be a working housewife, and the other by writing that she would really like to be a professional but that she didn't think such a goal was realistic. The above results have been reported in detail in order to document the impression produced by enrollees' information of careful and honest responses.

Enrollees' Estimates of Goal Achievement

Three-fourths of the Co-Op subjects estimated that they had a "very good" or "fairly good" chance of achieving their ten-year goal (see Table 47). This general optimism was markedly less prevalent among subjects with non-clerical occupational goals, only 54 percent of whom considered their chances of goal achievement to be "fairly good" or better. Significantly more of the subjects with non-clerical goals considered the achievement of their goals to be "unlikely."

TABLE 47

ENROLLEES' ESTIMATES OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT AND OCCUPATIONAL GOALS

Estimates	Occupational Goals			
	Clerical (N=80)	Professional through Machine Operator[a] (N=20)	Other[b] (N=27)	Total (N=127)
	Percent			
1--Very good	37%	7%	71%	37%
2--Fairly good	39	47	21	38
3--Not so good	15	12	7	13
4--Unlikely	9	35	0	12
Total	100%	101%	99%	100%
No report (number)	(5)	(3)	(13)	(21)

[a] Includes Professional, Semi-Professional, Technicians, Skilled Manual and Machine Operator.

[b] Includes Unskilled and no reported occupational goal (housewife, don't know, and no report).

Impediments to Goal Achievement

Twenty-nine percent of the Co-Op subjects reporting foresaw no difficulties in achieving their occupational goals (see Table 48). Educational deficiencies, often associated with lack of money for education, were seen as possible impediments by one-third of the Co-Op subjects, and lack of proficiency was identified as a possible impediment by 17 percent of the subjects. Possible impediments were, of course, most apt to be reported by enrollees who were pessimistic about their chances of goal achievement.

TABLE 48

ENROLLEES' VIEWS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO OCCUPATIONAL GOAL ACHIEVEMENT "IS THERE ANYTHING THAT MIGHT HOLD YOU BACK FROM GETTING THIS KIND OF WORK?"

Impediments	Number	Percent
"Nothing holding me back"	31	29%
Job skill deficiency	18	17
Educational deficiency, lack of high school diploma	21	20
Educational deficiency, lack of money for education	14	13
Family problems	12	11
Health	3	3
Racial discrimination	4	4
Other	3	3
No report	21	--
Total	127	100%

"Successful" and "Unsuccessful" Enrollees

As described in Chapter VI of this report, two groups of Co-Op subjects--"successful" and "unsuccessful"--were identified; and the association of selected variables and employment outcomes was investigated through the comparative analysis of these two groups. Similarly, the bearing of the variables reported in the present chapter was investigated through the comparative analysis of "successful" and "unsuccessful" enrollees. The present analysis involved percentage comparisons, and it should be borne in mind that, with the N's involved (19 and 26 respectively), fairly large percentage differences were necessary in order to establish statistical significance.

Compared to "unsuccessful" enrollees, "successful" enrollees were very significantly more apt to have left the Co-Op for employment (see Table 49). On the other hand, "unsuccessful" enrollees were noticeably more apt to report that they might be held back from achieving their occupational goals by educational or skill deficiencies. No differences that were statistically significant were apparent in the rest of the "successful"-"unsuccessful" comparisons. These results suggested that termination towards employment rather than perceptions of the program or character of occupational goals was the best predictor of success.

Although not quite large enough to be statistically significant, several differences between the "successful" and "unsuccessful" groups indicated possible differentiations in the sense that, were the N's a little larger and the percentage differences maintained, the differences might be significant. In reports of what might make a person not want to get into Co-Op, "successful" enrollees were about twice as apt as "unsuccessful" enrollees to mention (1) the poor character or attitude of the potential enrollee, and (2) Co-Op conditions and personnel (including enrollees). The weight and character of these views implied that "successful" enrollees may have set themselves off from other enrollees (or potential enrollees) on the basis of ability to profit from the Co-Op opportunity; and although, perhaps, more aware of defects in program operations, "successful" enrollees had not themselves been seriously affected by such defects.

Differentiation between the two groups was also suggested in their reports of impediments to goal achievement. Nearly twice as many "successful" enrollees saw no impediments (nothing holding me back). A little more than twice as many "unsuccessful" enrollees, on the other hand, reported that they might be held

TABLE 49

ENROLLEE-REPORTED VARIABLES, "SUCCESSFUL" AND "UNSUCCESSFUL" CO-OP SUBJECTS

Variables	"Successful" (N=19)	"Unsuccessful" (N=26)	CL
	Percent		
Reasons for leaving Co-Op			
Left for employment	94%	41%	***
Most useful Co-Op experiences			
Work-relevant experiences most useful[a]	68	77	ns
Disliked aspects of Co-Op			
Co-Op policies, conditions, and personnel[b]	73	69	ns
Co-Op attractions			
Money mentioned as Co-Op attraction[c]	24	31	ns
Unattractive Co-Op aspects			
Unattractive to those lacking interest, willingness	46	24	ns
Co-Op policies, conditions, staff and enrollees[d]	39	18	ns
Occupational goals			
Clerical goals at time of termination	88	75	ns
Impediments to goal achievement			
"Nothing holding me back"	47	26	ns
Educational or skill deficiencies[e]	24	52	*

[a] See Table 42. Work-relevant experiences include "Employment," "Work habits," and "Job skills."

[b] See Table 43.

[c] See Table 44

[d] See Table 45

[e] See Table 48

back from goal achievement by educational or skill deficiencies. The somewhat larger percentages of non-clerical goals in the "unsuccessful" group--implying more need for post-program vocational preparation--may have contributed to this result. At the same time, three-fourths of the "unsuccessful" group had clerical goals and 52 percent were aware of serious skill and educational deficiencies. It can be concluded, therefore, that "unsuccessful" enrollees tended to feel less well-prepared for their careers, including clerical careers, than did "successful" enrollees.

It is of interest that most of the enrollees--both "successful" and "unsuccessful"--viewed the work-relevant aspects of Co-Op as the most useful, and that only a minority in both groups viewed the Co-Op as a way of earning money. In other words, enrollees in both groups tended to view the program as primarily useful in terms of occupational preparation rather than as, in itself, a kind of employment.

Summary

Looking back on their Co-Op experience, most enrollees rated the program as "very useful." In a structured response, Co-Op subjects checked on the average, six useful aspects of the program, and specifically work-relevant aspects were most frequently designated. In an unstructured response, more than half of the Co-Op subjects described work-relevant experiences as "most useful." Employment after Co-Op was one of the aspects or experiences considered as work-relevant; but, in both the structured and the unstructured responses, employment was out-weighed by other work-relevant areas (getting job skills, good work habits, learning to work for a boss). In the enrollees' retrospective view, then, the Co-Op was primarily useful as occupational preparation. At the time of follow-up, 72 percent of the Co-Op subjects who were in the labor force were employed--a circumstance that may have helped to emphasize the usefulness of Co-Op training.

Program exits to employment were very significantly associated with "successful" adjustments to the world of work. The criteria of "success" included maintained employment. The high frequency of "successful" enrollees' perceptions of the usefulness of work-relevant training was thus consonant with their post-program experience. "Unsuccessful" enrollees also valued the program for its work-relevant aspects, but they tended to feel that they had not prepared sufficiently to achieve their occupational goals. Their inadequate occupational preparation may have been partly due to a tendency to choose non-clerical goals; and, among those with clerical goals, a tendency to have left the program before achieving employment-level competency.

"Successful" enrollees were somewhat more apt to formulate criticims of the program. The program drawbacks that they described obviously had not critically affected their own "success." Enrollees' views of the Co-Op thus did not relate directly to program outcomes. Rather, these views suggested attitudes which were particularly conducive to realizing benefits from the program which, in turn, led to improved employability. Enrollees who viewed the program as an opportunity, for example, seemed to profit more from the experience than those who viewed the program as a kind of employment--even though the former were more sensitive to program shortcomings.

VIII

Case Studies

This chapter presents a number of cases selected to illustrate how the Co-Op "worked" (or didn't "work"). The information for these case illustrations came from a number of sources. In chronological order, the first information came from the standard NYC Enrollee Record (#16). Next, information from the Beginning Interview is presented, followed by the results of school and police record searches and of initial Co-Op testing. Program experience is then described, based on information in the Termination Interview. In this section of the cases, work assignments to NYC agencies have been designated "NYC" and those to cooperating businesses have been designated "NYC-OJT." Enrollees provided the information presented in Enrollee Follow-Up, and employers provided the information presented in Employer Follow-Up.

Case 1 shows the Co-Op operating effectively in a typical situation. The enrollee in this case was the graduate of a ghetto high school and her employability needs involved the acquisition of performance skills and behaviors. Co-Op experience concentrated on skill acquisition in the Education Center with two NYC-OJT work assignments--both to the same employer. Work supervisor evaluation of the enrollee's performance in the first assignment apparently led to improved performance which, in turn, led to placement in the NYC-OJT firm. Counseling and the placement-potential of work assignments were also significant factors in the benefit that this enrollee derived from Co-Op.

It might be noted that, although this enrollee had achieved "very good" grades throughout high school, her reading grade level was 7.7 and her arithmetic grade level was 5.9. It might also be noted that, although her high school clerical preparation enabled her to place in the 62nd percentile on the General Clerical Skills test, she had been unable to get a job after graduation. Finally, it might be noted that, although this enrollee apparently had no salient personal or attitudinal problems, personal development was seen to be an area of gain by the Co-Op staff and a program-related value by the enrollee.

Case 1: Negro female. High school graduate, single, no children, living in two-parent family of eight. Last job: in-school NYC and no job since graduation. Out of school one month. Enrollment age: 17

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school and enrollee felt able to do the work of "general clerk" "fairly well." Her lifetime occupational goal was "private secretary." Interviewer impressions: "3" in cleanliness, neatness, and correctness of speech; "4" in dress, posture, healthy appearance, poise, clarity and fluency of speech, and confidence, and "5" in voice, friendliness and interest. Interviewer considered goal to be "reasonable" and commented, "_______ was a bit frustrated by not being able to obtain a job after completion of high school with fairly good grades. She realized, after several failures, that her high school skills were not enough and that there was much room for improvement."

Records and Test Results: School grades "very good" in all four years of high school. IQ: 96. No record of police contact.

Reading grade level, 7.7; arithmetic grade level, 5.9; General Clerical skills percentile, 62; typing speed, 24 WPM.

NYC Experience: In Co-Op eight months, two NYC-OJT work assignments--both to same company. Hired by company as regular employee.

First supervisor evaluation: Enrollee was rated "satisfactory" or "average" in all areas except that, in "ability to learn," she was "rather slow to learn." Supervisor wrote, "_______ needs some training and practice in various types of filing. We did concentrate on alpha and numeric the last week but needs reinforcement. She also needs practice in typing. Spelling, grammar, and vocabulary not observed during this section except in daily speech which appears to be average. Must learn to ask questions when she does not understand. General attitude very good, well liked and accepted by co-workers." In summary, "_______ is still a little shy, but this does not hinder her ability to perform."

Second supervisor evaluation: Enrollee was rated "above average" and "exceptional." "Ability to learn" was rated "learns very quickly." Supervisor wrote, "_______ is a real 'peach of a gal.' We are very happy with her and are striving to find a permanent job for her. We are sure we'll make it."

Two-thirds of enrolle's enrollment has been in classroom work which stressed clerical skills and English and arithmetic. Counseling time had been taken up, for the most part, with the enrollee's family troubles and with her appearance. Termination Interviewer rated her "3" in cleanliness, neatness, and correctness, and correctness of speech (no change) and "4" or "5" in other areas. Enrollee's overall improvement in employability rated "5." Interviewer wrote that the enrollee had gained in that she "learned acceptance of others' personal differences. Learned how to get ahead with limited skills by showing initiative on the job;" and also "The program aided _______ by giving her an opportunity to get into a cooperating company and showing them what an asset she could be when given the chance."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee was regular full-time employee of NYC-OJT employer, working as "secretary to three buyers in purchasing," and being paid $2.08 an hour. She had worked for this employer continuously in the three months since leaving Co-Op.

Enrollee gave "help from supervisor," "help from counselor," and overall usefulness of the program the highest rating, "5." She mentioned the "most useful" aspects of the program as "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," "continuing education," and "having an interesting job." She wrote that a person might want to get into Co-Op because "this program provides you with training that you didn't get or complete in high school and builds hope." As for what might make a person not want to get into Co-Op, she wrote, "Nothing! Any time there is a chance to better yourself and even to be paid for it, and any time there is a job possibility for you, and people who care enough to help you, then why not grasp this opportunity."

In 10 years, enrollee hoped to be working in "the same type of work only I hope to have reached the top by then (private secretary)." She thought her chances were "very good." In response to the question, "Is there anything that might hold you back?" she wrote, "No! Only if I give up hope and stop showing an interest in all that I do--which I never plan to do. The doors are open now."

Enrollee's responses were typed and she added this postscript: "It was a pleasure to talk about my experiences once again about the Co-Op program, therefore the check really isn't necessary. Thank you." Follow-up age: 18.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer confirmed length of employment, rate of pay, and rated work performance as "average to good."

Case 2 shows the Co-Op operating to achieve employability with a dropout. Identifiable program factors were much the same as in Case 1, but the enrollee in Case 2 had not finished high school, had a poor school record and a record of police contact, and had been out of school more than two years without having held a job. The enrollee's background in this case connoted more serious skill deficiencies and the possibility of poor work attitudes. Initial testing showed this enrollee to be less skill-deficient than the high school graduate, and the impression that she made of being "ambitious and realistic" proved to be correct. In the

Co-Op had not been able to provide training closely related to employment, it is probable that it could not have helped this enrollee. The realistic training provided by the Co-Op, however, very effectively involved this enrollee; and, in a comparatively short time, she became a valued regular employee with every prospect of continued employment success.

Case 2: Negro female. Left school after 11th grade because of pregnancy. Single, one child, living in mother-only family of six, in public housing and receiving welfare assistance. Never held a job, and out of school 25 months. Enrollment age: 18.

Beginning Interview: Occupational preparation in high school. Enrollee reported her typing at 67 WPM, and that she could do clerical work "pretty well." Her lifetime occupational goal was "secretary." Interviewer impressions: "2" in neatness, "3" in other appearance areas and in fluency, grammar, and voice and in confidence; and "4" in clarity of speech and friendliness. Interviewer considered her goal to be "reasonable" and wrote, "seems to be ambitious and realistic."

Records and Test Results: An "average" student in freshman year and a "poor" student in sophomore and junior years. IQ: 108. Record of five police contacts involving fighting and stealing.

Reading grade level, 11.1; arithmetic grade level, 9.5; General Clerical Skills percentile, 94.

NYC Experience: In Co-Op for four months with two NYC-OJT assignments--both to same employer. Hired by NYC-OJT employer after second assignment.

First supervisor evaluation: Average in all areas, but noted, "Needs assistance in developing office presence, including clarity of speech. Could use training in working faster, particularly with filing. I believe her business Math should also be emphasized. During her next work period, we can put her to use also if she improves her typing skills. With these suggested areas of improvement, I believe she could be a very fine employee."

After six weeks at the Education Center, apparently well spent, enrollee went on second assignment which led to her employment.

Counseling emphasized two problem areas: "poor concept of self," and "high mentality with low aspiration." Termination interviewer rated overall improvement in employability "4" and rated her "4" or "5" in all impression areas except appearance areas which were rated "3." Interviewer commented, "was finally convinced that she could and should aspire to a good job due to her own capabilities. This was borne out by her early employment."

Enrollee Follow-Up: In the 14 months since leaving Co-Op, enrollee has been continuously employed as a clerk-typist at the NYC-OJT worksite, being paid $1.85 an hour.

She rated the Co-Op very high and mentioned many ways in which it had been useful to her. To the useful options, she added that it had been useful because it had taught her to manage her own money and to learn to do her best work.

In ten years she wanted to be doing about the same kind of work, but by then she wanted to be a private secretary to someone.

Enrollee appended two typed pages of "comments" to her self-report. After making suggestions for the improvement of the program, she reported, ". . . I was one of the lucky ones. When I took the typing test for this course I typed 12 words per minute and had 8 errors. Within a week I was typing 25 words per minute. I admit I had my days when I didn't want to do anything but talk, and joke, etc., but when I really became interested I did my best. I am not bragging, but I was in that program exactly two and one-half weeks when I was sent on a job to take a test. I passed with very high marks (due to the classes which I took during my short stay) and was hired less than two months afterwards. There are still girls in that program who were there before I was and they still are, they aren't interested is about all I can say. . .I could go on for hours about this matter, but I have to get back to work. My supervisor was kind enough to let me do this on office time and I don't want to take advantage of him. He has done everything in his power to help me this past year, and I am proud to say that he is proud of me. He has even sent me to teletype school so that's another experience."

Follow-up age: 19.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer confirmed employment and gave enrollee an "outstanding" rating in overall work performance.

Case 3 illustrates employability needs stemming from personal problems as well as from ineffective preparation for employment in high school and shows how multiple enrollments can be effective in such cases. The enrollee in this case was an "average-to-good" student in high school, but had been unable to get a job in the seventeen months since graduation. She attributed her job-hunt failure to the fact that she was "unusually tiny." She gave the impression of being "well-motivated and confident," however, and initial testing indicated she had good background skills. Personality problems became evident in her first work assignment where her "attitude and temper were found too disrupting for an office situation." Between enrolling in Co-Op and going on her first work assignment, this enrollee had severe family problems and left the program for a time. When she returned, counseling was concentrated on her family problems and her self-control; and, after about a year in Co-Op, she was considered to have made great improvement in employability. Her second work assignment was very successful and she was hired by her second assignment employer.

The importance of effective counseling is apparent in Case 3, and this, in turn, implies the importance of achieving a real relationship with the enrollee. Without such a relationship, aborted first enrollments often cannot be retrieved by subsequent enrollments. It should also be noted that the other elements of Co-Op training (cycled work experience and placement potential in work assignments) were as necessary to the outcome in this case as were Co-Op re-enrollment and counseling.

Case 3: Negro female. High school graduate. At time of enrollment, single, no children, living with both parents in a family of four. Was in in-school NYC but had never held any other job. Out of school about 17 months. Enrollment age: 19.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school and an incompleted course in a business college. Enrollee felt that she could do secretarial work "well" and her lifetime occupational goal was "secretary." Interviewer rated her "3" in dress and "4" in all other appearance, speech, and attitude areas. Interviewer thought her occupational goal was "reasonable." Interviewer noted that enrollee was unusually tiny, and commented that enrollee was, "well-motivated, confident, with good self-image. Has already been turned down for jobs because of her height."

Records and Test Results: "Average" and "good" school grades. No record of police contact.

Reading grade level, 10.0; arithmetic grade level, 7.7; typing speed, 60 WPM.

NYC Experience: Shortly after enrollee had been enrolled, she left the program because of pregnancy. After the birth of her baby, she re-entered Co-Op and was in the program a little over a year. She spent the major portion of her enrollment in the Education Center, but she did have two NYC-OJT work assignments. She was hired as a regular employee by the second firm

After her first work assignment, the personnel director of the cooperating business indicated that, although the enrollee's work was very good, her attitude and temper were too disrupting in an office situation. In her second work assignment the cooperating business was so pleased with the enrollee's performance that the enrollee was hired shortly after completing her assignment.

Counseling was concentrated in the areas of "poor emotional health" and "family and domestic troubles," as well as self-control. It was noted, "Enrollee was outspoken and had a high temper which caused her to lose her first co-op job." At the time of termination, enrollee's overall improvement in employability was rated "5." All appearance, speech and attitude areas were rated "4" or "5" with the exception of "friendliness" which the Termination Interviewer rated at "2". The Termination Interviewer thought that the enrollee had gained particularly in "the ability to tolerate others and get along with co-workers and supervisors." Also, "Enrollee gained self-respect and independence after a difficult time with family and father of her child born out of wedlock."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee was working full-time in the job that she had gotten through Co-Op three months previously. This was a general clerical job involving "typing orders, letters, answering the 'phone," and paid $1.30 an hour.

Enrollee rated "help from supervisor," "help from counselor" and "overall usefulness of the program" at "5." She mentioned all aspects of the experience, except "earning money," as useful, but though the "most useful" experience was that she "learned self-control." She wrote that a person might want to get into Co-Op because it was "wonderful for helping you get a job." In connection with what might make a person not want to get into Co-Op, she wrote, "The first thing they think is that you are dumb if you are from NYC."

The enrollee looked forward to doing "what I am doing now" ten years hence. She evidently saw no reason why this goal should not be realized, because she marked both the items asking for her estimate of success chances and the item asking for possible holdbacks as "n.a." Follow-up age: 21.

Employer Follow-Up: The employer confirmed employment and rated her overall performance as "average to good."

Case 4 shows that somewhat sheltered placement procedures are sometimes crucial to post-program employment. In this case, the enrollee was too shy to succeed in pasing employment tests. Her NYC-OJT work assignment enabled her to qualify for employment through experience rather than through testing.

As in other cases, this case illustrates a number of needs and program responses. This enrollee, a high school graduate with less-than-seventh-grade skills, was more of a behavioral conformist than a performer--she adjusted to training and school situations but her rate of performance gain was low. Thus, we find her finishing high school and MDTA keypunch course, and spending five months in the regular NYC and twelve months in the Co-Op, but lacking the presence and self-confidence to go out and get a job. Although her progress must often have seemed to be negligible, her extended training ultimately led to the acquisition of performance skills that, as much as her protected placement, led to her satisfactory employment adjustment.

Case 4: Negro female. High school graduate, single, no children, living at home in a two-parent family of 10. Out of school seven months, and unemployed, looking for work for two weeks. Enrollment age: 20.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school and MDTA keypunch instruction. Enrollee considered herself "poor-fair" in clerical work, and held an operator certificate in keypunch. Interviewer rated her "2" in speech, interest and confidence, and "3" in dress, posture, and poise, but considered her life-time occupational goal of "secretary" to be "reasonable." Interviewer commented, "If shyness is overcome, enrollee has a good chance of employment, though general clerical testing indicates need for work in test-taking."

Records and Test Results: A "poor" student in her freshman year, but an "average" student in the last three years of high school. IQ: 78. No record of police contact.

Reading grade level, 6.5; arithmetic grade level, 6.4; General Clerical Skills percentile, 29.

NYC Experience: Was in the regular NYC for five months and in the Co-Op program for 12 months. While in Co-Op, had four work assignments. Her first work supervisor reported that enrollee very generally lacked employability, writing that additional training was needed in "spelling, grammar, vocabulary, clarity of speech. . .Personality needs developing, needs encouragement badly." Her subsequent work supervisors reported steady improvement, and she was hired as a regular employee by her fourth work assignment agency.

Counseling concentrated on "shyness and lack of presence as handicaps to employment" and quite a lot of progress was felt to have been made. Much work was also done in "practice interviews, job sophistication, and test orientation," but the enrollee did not succeed in passing any employment test. At the time of termination, enrollee's overall improvement in employability was rated "5." Her speech and confidence, however, were rated "3." Interviewer commented, "Enrollee could never pass written clerical tests. By placing her on OJT arrangement with hospital, where she worked excellently, she was able to qualify for position after six months experience without taking tests."

Enrollee Follow-Up: In the 15 months since leaving Co-Op, enrollee has been employed continuously by her NYC assignment employer, working as a clerk-typist at $2.00 an hour. Enrollee mentioned that the Co-Op had been useful to her through on-the-job training and experience, and schooling. Ten years from now she wants to be doing the same work that she is doing now. Follow-up age: 21.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer verified employment and rated work performance as "average to good." Employer added, "Mrs. _______ has been a very good employee and is very cooperative and her attitude is exceptionally good."

Case 5 shows how regular NYC enrollments can provide valuable preliminary preparation for formal skill training, and also illustrates the importance of maintaining post-program contact until employment adjustment has been achieved. The enrollee in this case, a 9th grade dropout, had correspondingly serious skill deficiencies. Not only had her academic training been cut short, but she had had no chance to gain clerical preparation in school. In addition to her skill deficiencies, this enrollee's record (expelled from school, unwed mother, and extensive record of police contact) indicated attitudinal difficulties--at least, in the past. This enrollee's experience included five months in the regular NYC and five months in the Co-Op, and she ultimately achieved success in the business world. The extent of her progress indicated, as her present employer noted, that this enrollee was "one of the outstanding successes of the NYC program."

NYC experience prior to Co-Op was undoubtedly a factor in this success since it supplied the preliminary clerical experience that enabled the enrollee to qualify for Co-Op, and it may also have stimulated her ambition. Although Case 5 is, generally, a success, it should be noted that Co-Op's placement was by no means optimum in this case. When she was ready for employment, all that could be found was seasonal work with the I.R.S.; and, when this ended, this enrollee was unemployed and back in Co-Op. This enrollee persisted in her commitment to the world of work, however, and the Co-Op persisted in its commitment to her so that satisfactory placement was ultimately achieved.

Case 6: Negro female. Left school for disciplinary reasons after 9th grade. Single, one child. Living in mother-only family of five, including enrollee's child. Enrollment age: 19.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in Adult Education and in the NYC. Enrollee rated her clerical ability as "fair" and said her lifetime occupational goal was "secretary." Interviewer rated her "2" in dress, poise, clarity and fluency of speech; "3" in cleanliness, neatness, grammar, voice, friendliness and confidence, and "4" in interest. Interviewer considered her goal to be "reasonable" and noted, "Enrollee finished only 9th grade, but is above average in intelligence and seems to have ambition and self-confidence."

Records and Test Results: A "good" student in freshman year. IQ: 95. Record of eight police contacts, including three detentions for runaway, and two arrests--one for strong arm robbery, and one for riding in a stolen car.

Reading grade level, 10.1; arithmetic grade level, 9.4; General Clerical Skills percentile, 48.

NYC Experience: Enrollee was in regular NYC for five months with two work assignments--neighborhood worker and program aide. Enrollee was in Co-Op for five months, with three NYC assignments, then went to the Internal Revenue Service for a four-month job. After that, enrollee returned to Co-Op for another two months of work at the Education Center. She was finally placed in permanent employment through the Co-Op.

First work supervisor rated enrollee's performance as unsatisfactory because of disorganized work habits, poor typing and an excessive tendency to stutter on the telephone. Second supervisor report gave enrollee above-average evaluations in all areas but noted some carelessness. Third supervisor reported no need for further training (except in general education) and wrote, "I feel that _______ is ready for a permanent job, and if I had been able, I would have hired her permanently."

At the time of her temination to the I.R.S. job, most counseling time had been spent on family problems and the enrollee's appearance. Counselor noted that education had also been stressed, and that considerable progress had occurred in enrollee's social attitudes, "she was very self-contained and unfriendly with peers until recently." She was rated as having made great improvement in overall employability. Interviewer wrote, "gets along very well with peers and superiors," and "she has increased her vocabulary and use of English far beyond expectations (mine, not hers)."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee had been continuously employed in the 13 months since leaving Co-Op (the second time). She worked as a secretary and was paid $1.87 an hour.

Enrollee circled all optional aspects of Co-Op as being useful, except "learning to get along better with other people." She rated the overall usefulness of the program "5" and felt the work experience had been most useful. A person might want to get into the program, she wrote, "because if they do get into it and work hard at it they can get a better job." A person might not want Co-Op, "if they were high school graduates--when I was there they had classes like English. Some might feel they were going back to school."

In 10 years, enrollee wanted to be doing the same kind of work that she presently is doing. Follow-up age: 21.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer confirmed employment and gave the rate of pay as $2.00. He rated her overall performance as "outstanding" and added, "Mrs. _______ is our chief secretary and in our opinion one of the greatest successes of the NYC program. Mrs _______ has shown without any doubt that, contrary to public opinion, people from under-privileged backgrounds are willing to become productive members of our society if only given the chance."

Case 6 shows the importance of flexible program responses to employability needs. In this case, Co-Op experience occurred in two blocks, the first and longest being in the Education Center and the second consisting of several months in a single NYC-OJT work assignment. The characteristic Co-Op feedback cycle of alternating classroom/work assignment experience was thus replaced, in this case, with extended classroom preparation followed by extended NYC-OJT training. The enrollee in this case, a dropout with negligible clerical skills and observable attitudinal problems, apparently needed--first and foremost--extensive classroom and counseling work.

Case 6: Negro female. Left school after completing 10th grade for "economic" reasons. Living in mother-only family of 11, on relief. Out of school 11 months and never held a job of 30 days or more. Enrollment age: 18.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school, and enrollee rated her clerical ability as "good." Lifetime occupational goal: "office worker." Interviewer rated her "2" in friendliness and interest, "3" in all speech areas, and "4" in all appearance areas and in confidence. Interviewer considered goal to be "reasonable,"; but, commented, "Attitude is surly, some work must be done before interviews are undertaken."

Records and Test Results: School records indicated that enrollee had graduated from an evening high school and had, accordingly, been out of school about seven months when she applied for enrollment. Her grades had been "C's" and "D's" for the most part. No police record.

Reading grade level, 7.8; arithmetic grade level, 5.8; General Clerical Skills percentile, 03.

NYC Experience: In the Co-Op about 11 months, and spent most of time at Education Center acquiring job skills and good work habits. Sent to a single NYC-OJT work assignment after much work at Education Center. Remained on this assignment for several training "tours" and was then hired permanently by co-operating firm.

When terminated, enrollee's lifetime goal was "secretary." The interviewer rated her "4" or "5" in all areas of appearance, speech and attitude. The interviewer wrote, that the enrollee has "gained realization that work habits should be good and constant. Learned to accept constructive criticism and benefit from it."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee was working full-time as a "Collection Typist" and was paid $1.75 an hour. She had had this job since leaving Co-Op--about nine months.

Enrollee rated the program's usefulness "5" and considered the useful aspects of the program to be: "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," "getting job skills," "continuing education," and "having an interesting job." The "most useful" part of Co-Op was "on-the-job training."

In 10 years she wanted work "the same as my present job, Collection Typist (Secretary)," and she thought her chances were "very good."

Her "additional comment" was, "Ask counselors and teachers to take more interest in students who really want to help themselves." Follow-up age: 19.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer confirmed enrollee's employment, and rate her overall performance as "average to good." Employer added, "_______ has done a real fine job for us as witnessed by the fact that she was recently promoted to collection clerk-typist."

Case 7 shows how lack of motivation, as well as skill deficiencies, can be replaced through formal skill training by confidence, motivation to succeed in the business world, and behavioral and performance skills supporting successful employment adjustment. Many of the features of this case also appear in cases previously presented. In Case 7, however, the attitudinal problem complicating employability needs in skill areas seemed to be a general lack of motivation towards employment rather than specific personality maladjustments. The enrollee in this case, a dropout with considerable educational deficiencies, gained her clerical preparation in the regular NYC. On her enrollment in Co-Op, she gave the impression of being slow and lacking in self-confidence, and her first supervisor evaluation raised the question of whether this enrollee should be in clerical training at all. Subsequent supervisor evaluations became so laudatory that they seem to have been written about another individual and it was noted by the Co-Op staff that a "miraculous change" seemed to have occurred. This enrollee terminated to regular employment with her NYC-OJT employer. She still had this job at the time of follow-up and was, in addition, working to complete her high school education.

The question of motivation is central to the effectiveness of programs such as the Co-Op. With motivation (as, for example, in Case 2) training can result in employability in a comparatively short time; and, until motivation is established, as in this case, progress can be very slow. Case 7 shows that patience, experience and counseling can create the essential motivation and that this motivation, once created, is a powerful force that continues to operate in the post-program period.

Case 7: Negro female. Completed ninth grade, leaving school for reasons of "health." Married, one child, and living with husband. Never held a job. Out of school 14 months. Enrollment age: 16.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in the NYC and enrollee reported typing at 20 WPM. Her lifetime occupational goal was "clerk typist." Interviewer Impressions: "3" in posture, fluency, and correctness of speech, and interest; "4" in all other areas. Interviewer considered goal of the enrollee to be "reasonable." Interviewer commented, "Very slow in answering questions. Seemed to lack confidence in self."

Records and Test Results: No school or police record.
Reading grade level, 6.7; arithmetic grade level, 5.0; General Clerical Skills percentile, 24.

NYC Experience: In regular NYC for eight months, with clerical work assignment, and in Co-Op for about 13 months. Enrollee spent most of her time in Education

Center, but had two work assignments--one, NYC and the other, NYC-OJT.

First supervisor evaluation: Enrollee below average in all performance areas and supervisor recommended improvement in clerical and academic work. Supervisor commented, "_______ showed very little interest in her work and was not very responsive to supervision. Possibly clerical work is a little out of line for her because she definitely lacks ability and initiative."

Second supervisor evaluation: Enrollee average or above average in all relevant areas (supervisor noted that "the clerical duties in our office do not include typing"). Supervisor commented, "_______'s work performance in our office was very satisfactory. She has good learning ability, shows interest in her work and has a perfect attendance record. _______ is a dependable person with a pleasing personality. We definitely feel that she is ready for 40 hour employment and hope to place her in our organization."

While she was in Co-Op, enrollee went to night school for two semesters, putting in three hours a week in clerical courses. Counseling emphasized the importance of attendance and punctuality, and it was felt that the enrollee had made considerable progress. Termination Interviewer rated her "5" in friendliness, interest, and confidence. Interviewer commented, "Enrollee could see the need for advanced education if she wished to make greater progress in the business world. Enrollee showed miraculous change in appearance and grooming after working in a large, fashionable department store. Enrollee was also able to help with family support and was proud."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee still in job she got "co-oping"--full-time records clerk. She had held the job for three months, and was paid $1.60 an hour.

Enrollee gave a "5" in all ratings of the Co-Op, and mentioned the following aspects as being useful: "help in getting a job," "help from counselor," "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," "getting job skills," and "continuing education." The "most useful" part of Co-Op was "It got me to thinking about continuing my education, really."

In 10 years, enrollee wanted to be working as a "private secretary," and thought her chances were "fairly good." She felt that she might be held back by "my education, if I don't get it. But I am going to night school--I might graduate in August." Follow-up age: 18.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer confirmed enrollee's employment and rated her overall performance as "outstanding."

Case 8 shows that the effect of Co-Op experience may not be adequately reflected in labor market status at a time of follow-up. Although this enrollee was working part-time when followed-up, she may, in time, become an outstanding example of program effectiveness. In this case, part-time employment was associated with a full schedule of schooling. Also, the enrollee had previously worked for this employer full-time and he valued her work highly. The enrollee in this case had thus demonstrated her capacity for satisfactory employment and her perseverance in schooling indicated that she would continue to develop her employability. This enrollee's comparatively high intelligence undoubtedly contributed to the quality of her response to Co-Op training; and, it should also be noted, preliminary experience in the standard NYC program probably also contributed to the effectiveness of Co-Op training.

Case 8: Negro female. Tenth grade education, left school for marriage. At time of NYC enrollment, had two children and was, herself, head of her household. She had been out of school three years, and it had been six weeks since her last employment, a "service" job paying $.90 an hour. Enrollment age: 19.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in the NYC, and lifetime occupational goal was "IBM machine operator." Interviewer rated her "3" in dress, cleanliness, neatness, healthy appearance, and fluency of speech; "4" in posture, clarity and correctness of speech, voice, interest, and confidence; and "5" in friendliness. Interviewer considered her goal to be "reasonable."

Records and Test Results: "Average" student in the two years she was in high school. IQ: 108. No record of police contact.

Reading grade level, 10.6; General Clerical Skills percentile, 93. Typing speed, 14 WPM.

NYC Experience: In NYC for five months with clerical assignment. Transferred to Co-Op, and in program for four months with one NYC work assignment of four weeks, one month before termination. Dropped from program because of pregnancy.

Experience concentrated on classroom work and job skill acquisition and improvement. Her overall improvement in employability was rated "3." She was typing 40 WPM on termination.

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee was in school "full-time" making up her high school education ("so far I have had Social Civics, Psychology, American Literature and Geometry"). She was also working part-time (24 hours a week at $1.65 an hour) for an employer that she had found through her Co-Op work assignment. In 10 years, she wanted to be working as a "business machine operator," thought her chances of doing so were "fairly good" and the only thing that might hold her back was "the money which pays for the courses."

Enrollee rated the usefulness of Co-Op "5," and mentioned "learning good work habits," "getting job skills," "help from counselor and supervisor," and "continuing education" as particularly useful aspects. The "most useful" part of the experience was "the continuation of my education. There is always so much to learn." Enrollee commented, "It would be a much better program if a thirty day trial period was given to every student before they were accepted. This would help keep out the ones who are there mainly for the money and not for training." Follow-up age: 21.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer confirmed employment, rated the enrollee's performance as "outstanding". Employer indicated that enrollee had worked for him for the past 10 months and had been a full-time employee prior to her present part-time work. Employer commented, "Mrs. _______ is an exceptional secretary and bookkeeper. In the field of bookkeeping works well and very accurately with CPA. Also expresses office correspondence of mail, letters, etc. unusually well. Thanks for the opportunity to recommend Mrs. _______."

Case 9, like Case 1, illustrates the inadequacy of ghetto high school preparation for clerical employment. Unlike Case 1, however, Case 9 also shows ineffective clerical preparation in Co-Op, and the apparent reason for this was the shortness of the Co-Op enrollment. In this case, it seems likely that counseling was unproductive and that routine follow-up contact might have resulted in re-enrollment and the achievement of employability.

In addition to inadequate school preparation, the enrollee in this case had attitudinal difficulties that were apparent at the outset. She had a "low boiling point" and her follow-up indicated that she probably quit the Co-Op because of a "run-in" with her counselor. Paradoxically, the fact that this enrollee was a graduate may have contributed to the difficulties that she had in adjusting to work training (and work) in that she did not accept the fact of her need for more preparation. As a "graduate," this enrollee tended to attribute her performance difficulties to the shortcoming of others rather than to her own inadequate preparation. The enrollee in this case was apparently motivated to "be" a very good secretary but not to "become" one. If counseling had reached a more productive level, this enrollee might have benefited more from her Co-Op enrollment; and, in view of her subsequent experience, follow-up contact might find her more receptive to clerical training.

Case 9: Negro female. High school graduate, single, no children, living with (disabled) father and (housewife) mother in public housing. No work experience except in-school NYC. Out of school four months. Enrollment age: 20.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school. Enrollee considered her typing ability to be "above average" and her lifetime occupational goal was to be "a very good secretary." Interviewer rated enrollee "4" in most areas of appearance, speech, and attitude and considered her goal to be "reasonable." Interviewer noted, "has low boiling point."

Records and Test Results: An "average" student throughout high school. IQ: 78. Two recorded police contacts.

Reading grade level, 7.8; arithmetic grade level, 6.6; General Clerical Skills percentile, 28.

NYC Experience: In Co-Op four months with one NYC work assignment. Supervisor rated her overall performance "about average" and noted that she needed additional work in grammar. Spent next two months in Education Center and then terminated on her own initiative to take job in credit department of a large retail store.

Counseling emphasized "control of temper, getting along with others, appropriate dress (enrollee over-dressed), readiness for employment." Enrollee was considered to have left program prematurely but to have achieved a "more realistic attitude about others--enrollee was highly critical of anyone who had different standards than her own."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee had had two jobs since leaving Co-Op, one lasting four and one-half months and the other, one and one-half months. She quit the second job because "they were prejudiced, and was too much work, and not enough money." She was unemployed at the time of follow-up.

Enrollee rated the overall usefulness of the Co-Op "5" and considered "help in getting a job after NYC" the most useful aspect of it. What she disliked about her experience was that (she) "never got a job from where she was working." She felt that her counselor had not been at all helpful because (had) a "run-in" with her so she denied help" Follow-up age: 21.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer in most recent job confirmed employment and rated enrollee's performance as "unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement." Employer reported that employee had "quit because she stated she didn't like the work." Employer commented, "_______ was very willing to learn, but she had been poorly trained in typing and office routine. She wanted to do a good job, but was prevented from doing so due to improper training. During the time she was here, her typing did improve, but she was unable to keep up with a routine work load, and consequently became discouraged."

Case 10, an enrollee terminated by the Co-Op becuase of her poor attendance, might have benefited from a furlough. At the time of follow-up, this enrollee had been unemployed for fifteen months, and her comparatively short Co-Op enrollment seemed to have been completely ineffective in achieving employability. On the other hand, she had positive appreciations of the program and impressed her interviewer as being willing to improve her preparation. It is possible that, had contact with the program been maintained, this enrollee would have re-enrolled and made more progress toward employability.

Case 10: Negro female. Dropped out of school after completing 10th grade for "health" reasons. Single, one child, living in welfare-assisted, mother-only family of six. Out of school 12 months, and never held a job. Enrollment age: 18.

Beginning Interview: Occupational preparation in high school, but felt unable to do any kind of work on enrollment. Lifetime occupational goal: "Secretary." Interviewer rated enrollee "2" in neatness, posture, poise, clarity, fluency and correctness of speech, and confidence, "3" in dress, cleanliness, appearance, and voice, and "4" in all other areas. Interviewer considered enrollee's goal to be "low" and commented, "above average intelligence with higher potential. Enrollee's self-image is poor. It will take much counseling to help her help herself. Speech patterns are very poor; grooming needs work as well."

Records and Test Results: A poor student in her two high school years. IQ: 75. Record of two police contacts during last year in school.
Arithmetic grade level, 8.7 (only test results reported).

NYC Experience: In the program about five months, and terminated by the program, primarily because of her poor attendance. Worked only at the Education Center and had no work assignments. At the time of her termination, she was rated "2" in overall improvement in employability. Her typing speed had improved to 20 WPM, but her occupational goal was considered to be too "high."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee had been out of the Co-Op for 15 months at the time of follow-up. She was unemployed but looking for work at that time, as she had been in the entire post-Co-Op period. She was head of her own welfare-assisted household (her husband was in jail) and expecting another child at the time of follow-up. Follow-up age: 21.

Enrollee liked the program "very much," thought her NYC work was "very important" and rated the overall usefulness of the program "3." The "most useful" part of the experience was "having an interesting job" and "help in getting a job" and "getting job skills" were also useful aspects of the program. A person might want to get into Co-Op, she noted, because "it gives you an opportunity to learn the things you wanted to learn such as different trades." What she liked best about her experience was "being with people."

In ten years, this enrollee wanted to be doing secretarial or clerical work and thought her chances were "fairly good." She might be held back, she thought, by "the lapse of time I been out of work and touch with people." She impressed her interviewer quite well, being rated "3" in correctness of speech, but "4" or "5" in all other areas. The interviewer also thought that the enrollee had a "fairly good" chance of achieving her occupational goal, and wrote, "The respondent needs more educational background and training, but is willing to go back to school."

Case 11 illustrates a difficult situation that might have been improved through routine follow-up. As in Case 10, the enrollee in this case was terminated by the program; but, in this case, enrollee attitudes were seen as the primary source of her failure to adjust to either classroom or work experience. This enrollee repeatedly impressed others with her ability and social facility, but also repeatedly failed to accept performance standards in work training and in work. Her social facility enabled her to say the "right" things but her verbal behavior was not directly related to her performance level so that, characteristically, one supervisor reports that the enrollee showed her "a gread deal of personal respect and was submissive to authority" and also that she used the phone constantly for private conversations and didn't take much interest in her work. Individuals who try to help young women such as this often end up saying, like her most recent employer, "Don't know what the answer is for this girl. . ."

The Co-Op terminated this enrollee because she had failed to adjust to Co-Op training and was not, apparently, benefiting from it. She went in to the world of work at this point where she operated on her own terms and failed to achieve lasting employment. This enrollee was, at the time of follow-up, only marginally employable and in need of more help. Since she viewed the Co-Op, in retrospect, as a good thing, it may be that she will try to re-establish contact with the program. If so, the Co-Op may get another chance to work with her in the very difficult area of her work attitudes. Routine follow-up might hasten this opportunity.

This enrollee was also in the Prospective study and presented a considerable locating problem to the Prospective study interviewers. Their experience has been included in the account of this case, because "rebels" like this enrollee often are involved in circumstances that compound locating problems.

Case 11: Negro female. Completed 10th grade after which she "lost interest" in school. Single, no children, living with father and mother in family of four. Out of school three months. Enrollment age: 16.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school, "C's" and "B's" in typing. Enrollee of "average" clerical competence. Lifetime occupational goal: "nurse." Interviewer rated enrollee "4" or "5" in all areas of appearance, speech, and attitude and considered her goal to be "reasonable." Interviewer commented: "_______ is well-groomed. She wants to be a nurse but she is not sure of her abilities."

Records and Test Results: School record not found. Police record of nine contacts from 1964, including two arrests and two detentions (runaway, shoplifting, and parole violation).

Reading grade level, 8.7; arithmetic grade level, 5.3; General Clerical Skills percentile, 30.

NYC Experience: In Co-Op four months with two NYC work assignments. First supervisor evaluated overall performance as "unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement." First supervisor rated enrollee's job attitude as "poor" and commented that enrollee was a "leader" with a bad influence on other enrollees and that she used the 'phone constantly for private conversations." She also wrote, "_______ showed the supervisor a great deal of personal respect and was very submissive to authority," and that the enrollee had a "lot of ability" but that she "didn't take enough interest in her work."

Second supervisor rated overall performance as "about average" but noted that enrollee "does not appear too interested in work."

Enrollee terminated to NYC after second assignment because of lack of progress in Co-Op and because of inability to adjust to classroom and work situations.

Counseling had been mainly directed towards the enrollee's "misconduct, immaturity, and unrealistic self-appraisal." At time of termination, it was felt that enrollee has made great improvement in her "attitude towards self," but that her overall employability improvement had been slight ("2"). At this time, the enrollee's goal was "clerk typist" and the interviewer considered it to be "reasonable." The interviewer commented, "Enrollee was extremely young and immature for the program. She verbalized well and gave the appearance of great maturity. Family problems were severe. _______ made no attempt to conform to rules of Education Center or offices. She learned little in Co-Op, but did increase typing speed somewhat."

Enrollee Follow-Up: In the 18 months since leaving Co-Op, enrollee had held three jobs and had been employed about 10 months. Enrollee, it should be noted, told interviewer that she had "a terrible memory for dates." After each job, she retired from the labor force, neither working nor looking for work. At the time of follow-up, she reported full-time employment in a convalescent home as a nurses' aide at $1.35 per hour. She said that she had held this job for three months.

Enrollee stated that her mother was "overly protective" and "wouldn't let her participate in any school activities" so she quit school and left home. She went to night school for a couple of months, and then enrolled in NYC. She mentioned only one assignment. She rated her liking of the NYC at "5" adding, "I've always been interested in being a typist and I didn't get half the training I needed in school." She rated the importance of NYC work "4" noting it was "important to me because I got so much out of it." She met with her counselor at least once a week, rated counselor helpfulness at "5," adding, "She was always boosting me--she always gave me a push--she wouldn't let me fail--without her I would have given up many times." What she liked best about her NYC experience was her "counselor."

Enrollee was living alone at the time of follow-up. In 10 years, she wanted to be working as a "clerk typist." She rated her chances of achieving this occupational goal as "very good," and felt that "nothing" would hold her back "other than the fact that I didn't complete school."

Two interviewers and nine calls were needed in order to secure the interview. The first interviewer made four calls to the home address, where enrollee said she was living at the time of enrollment. On the first call, no one came to the door, although a neighbor boy said there was someone at home. On the second call, the enrollee's mother said that she was "out" and that "she doesn't always stay here" but that she (the mother) would try to get a 'phone number through which the enrollee could be reached. No one was at home on the third call, and on the fourth call, the enrollee's brother said that there was "no way" in which enrollee could be reached. At this point, the interviewer left his own 'phone number and the request that the enrollee get in touch with him.

The second interviewer made two calls before getting close to an interview. On the first, no one was home; and, on the second, she confirmed through neighbors that enrollee did live at home address although no one answered the door. On the third visit, the enrollee's parents informed interviewer that she had moved and was working somewhere but that they expected her to visit them on a stated day. On this day, the interviewer again visited, but enrollee was not at the address. This visit, however, produced the locating directions that enabled the interviewer to find the enrollee and to interview her. Follow-up age: 18.

Employer Follow-Up: The enrollee's employer at the time of follow-up reported that the enrollee had worked for them three days at the rate of $1.15 an hour. She had been warned, and then fired, for sleeping in beds and chairs at the nursing home instead of working. The enrollee's use of the telephone was still being noted: "Week before RN discharged her, LPN had told me that she spent most of her time on the telephone. I personally had a long talk with her about doing her share of the work and gave another chance. However, as you can see, . . . it didn't help. I understand she spent the rest of the evening on the 'phone after the RN got her up the first time."

The Employer Follow-Up concluded with, "Don't know what the answer is for this girl. I think she could work and do a good job if she wanted to . . ."

Case 12 generally illustrates the importance of placement in realizing benefits from work training. This case also suggests that a training program may, perhaps, sometimes fall a victim to its own presuppositions. The enrollee in this case was noticeably obese. Her work assignment performance rose to "excellent" levels, but neither of two NYC-OJT employers offered her regular employment. At this point, the Co-Op terminated her to the regular NYC apparently concluding that the enrollee could only be placed with an NYC-OJT clerical employer. Follow-up information in this case indicated that the enrollee had gotten a seasonal non-clerical job after Co-Op in which her performance had been above average; and, also, that the enrollee was thinking of "working with children" as her occupational field. Although this enrollee had made great progress in her clerical training and was obese, it is possible that she could have been helped to satisfactory placement with a non-NYC-OJT employer, or, even, with a non-clerical employer.

Apart from a more intensive search for a "right" employer, the outcome in this case might have been improved through follow-up counseling that would help the enrollee to recognize her obesity problem and to do something about it.

Case 12: Negro female. Dropped out of school after 11th grade for "health" reasons. Married, one child. Out of school 11 months and never held a job. Enrollment age: 19.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school and in NYC (enrollee had been in typing class at Education Center a little more than a month before Co-Op began (May 29, 1966). Enrollee felt that she had "average" competency as a typist but had never held a job because "had a child to take care of." Enrollee's lifetime occupational goal: "clerical job." Interviewer rated her "1" in confidence, "2" in dress, cleanliness, and neatness; and "3" in all other areas except voice and friendliness which were rated "4." Interviewer consider goal to be "reasonable," and commented, "_______ is very short, fat with short arms and large head. This is a handicap so far as appearance is concerned, but not in ability to do clerical work."

Records and Test Results: "Average" student in three years of high school. IQ: 79. No record of police contacts.

Reading grade level, 6.5; arithmetic grade level, 6.1; General Clerical Skills percentile, 12.

NYC Experience: In Co-Op a little more than 10 months with five work assignments--three to NYC offices and two NYC-OJT.

Supervisors evaluations uniformly "average" to "good" on performance, and second evaluation noted, "I think could hold a permanent position at this time." As to appearance, this evaluation noted, "_______ should be encouraged to use a more moderate hair style, and lose some weight." The first NYC-OJT assignment, this enrollee's fourth work assignment, produced a similar report, the supervisor commenting, "My belief is that _______ is ready to work in the business world. Her only handicap is her weight. I hope she will be able to see this." Enrollee's performance was rated "excellent" in all areas after her fifth assignment, this supervisor also commenting, "I think _____ is ready for a permanent job, but perhaps she should be encouraged to lose weight."

Enrollee's overall improvement in employability was rated "5;" and she was rated "5" in most impression areas, including Confidence. Neither of the NYC-OJT employers, enrollee's competence notwithstanding, would hire her due to her obesity. The Co-Op was unable to achieve placement for her and she was placed in the regular NYC. Interviewer commented that enrollee had made gains in other areas than employability in that she "learned to dress well for her size, budget for her family, use community health services." Her major problems on termination were educational deficiency and obesity which "she did not like to recognize (as) liabilities."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee had part-time non-clerical employment at the time of follow-up, work that she found about seven months after leaving Co-Op.

Enrollee gave the program the highest ratings, and circled all optional aspects as being useful to her. What she found most useful, however, was the part of Co-Op that helped with "our speech, the way we dress, our posture, and getting along with others." She disliked nothing about Co-Op and wrote, "I really enjoyed the Co-Op program and wish I could work for the program again."

In 10 years, enrollee would like to be "working with children," but thought her chances were "not so good" because "I do not have a high school education. But I have worked with Head Start."

Enrollee commented, "The Co-Op program is a wonderful thing to be in. You can be something in life, the program has so much to offer, so many training skills. So if a person wants to be something in life and don't have a high school education that is the place to go. Because they will listen to your problems and will try to help you as much as possible. I am glad you wrote and ask me my opinion about the program. The questions I have answered are not lies. They are true." Follow-up age: 21.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer described employment as "seasonal," being full-time but irregular. Enrollee was not working for this firm at the time of follow-up. Her performance was rated "average to good."

Case 13 illustrates primarily a need for routine follow-up, but also shows the importance of finding a "right" employer. As in the preceding case, the enrollee in this case was obese and had done very well in her Co-Op training. This enrollee, furthermore, had terminated to regular employment with an NYC User Agency so that her case, initially, was a success story. Follow-up disclosed that she no longer had this job and had been terminated from a subsequent job because her performance was entirely unsatisfactory.

This report of her unsatisfactory performance is inconsistent with her Co-Op evaluation, which suggests that she might have profited from counseling during the period that she was adjusting to the world of work and, perhaps, might have been aided by an additional search for suitable employment.

Case 13: Negro female. Dropped out of school after 9th grade for "health" reasons. Single, one child, living in two-parent family of six. Out of school five years, and never employed. Enrollment age: 20.

Beginning Interview: Enrollee had no occupational preparation but felt able to perform clerical duties with "average" competence. Lifetime occupational goal: "Typist." Interviewer rated her "3" in dress, posture, fluency of speech, and friendliness; and "4" or "5" in all other areas. Interviewer considered goal to be "reasonable," and noted, "better than average vocabulary." Interviewer commented, "Excellent grooming is definite asset. If typing skills can be developed, she has above average potential for permanent employment. Ninth grade education is handicap for employment in this field."

Records and Test Results: IQ: 88. No record of police contact.

Reading grade level, 9.5; arithmetic grade level, 6.9; General Clerical Skills percentile, 35.

NYC Experience: Enrollee was in the Co-Op about 10 months, and worked on five NYC work assignments.

First supervisor evaluation rated performance "average" and "good." Supervisor wrote, "Enrollee performed her duties very well. She also despises idle time and would seek work on her own." This supervisor remarked on the enrollee's size but noted, "she gave a very good daily appearance and she wore the proper office attire." This supervisor recommended more work in spelling and typing.

The second report rated her work "very good" and "excellent" and noted enrollee's potentiality to become a "first class typist." No other supervisor report noted the size of this enrollee, and her final supervisor report noted that the enrollee "was ready for permanent placement as a file clerk."

This enrollee was tested at the time of termination with the following results: reading grade level, 10.2; arithmetic grade level, 6.9; General Clerical Skills percentile, 90.

She terminated to one of the NYC User Agencies. The Interviewer noted, "Enrollee is not self-conscious about her lack of education--reads on her own to improve herself, and has a good self-image. Due to educational deficiences and obesity, enrollee was placed on OJT with community agency where she was hired after two months."

Enrollee Follow-Up: At the time of follow-up, nearly 17 months since leaving the Co-Op, enrollee was unemployed and looking for work. She had held two jobs, the last one being seasonal, and had experienced about seven months of unemployment.

Enrollee rated the program as being "very useful," indicated that it was useful in all the optional ways provided by the questionnaire items. She reported that the "most useful" part was "learning good work habits such as being on time and following directions."

Enrollee was "thinking about going to I.B.M. school" and, if she went through this training, saw no reason why she couldn't be doing I.B.M. work in 10 years.

The interviewer who assisted in completing this follow-up commented, "________ is grossly overweight. Most employers would not consider her for medical reasons." Follow-up age: 22.

Employer Follow-Up: Employer reported that this enrollee had been terminated because her performance was "entirely unsatisfactory and unpromising."

Case 14 may illustrate the importance of motivation in achieving employment effectiveness. This enrollee, a high school graduate, seemed to have the potential for clerical employment in terms of skill preparation and to need help in matters of appearance and attitude. Employability needs such as these have been met by the Co-Op in many cases; but, in this case, the enrollee "lost interest" and was finally terminated by the Co-Op for poor attendance. At the time of follow-up, eight months later, this enrollee reported no post-Co-Op employment. She did, however, state that her occupational goal was "really" to be a "beautician." It is possible that she was uninterested in clerical preparation and that this lack of interest led to her poor performance in the Co-Op.

The question of vocational interest can be central to the effectiveness of a formal skill training program; and, the Co-Op attempted to screen out vocational misfits by ascertaining that all applicants were interested in clerical training. Since alternative skill training programs were not available to the applicant within the NYC program, this enrollee may have said she was interested in clerical training primarily to qualify for the program. A wider range of training programs might have permitted her to enter a program better suited to her interests.

Case 14: Negro female. High school graduate, single, one child, living in mother-only, welfare-assisted family of 11. Out of school 17 months and no job for 10 months. Last job as service worker at $1.50 an hour. Enrollment age: 19.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school, and enrollee felt able to do "office work" with "average" competence. Lifetime occupational goal: "Clerk typist." Interviewer rated her "2" in dress, cleanliness, neatness, friendliness, interest, and confidence; "3" in posture, appearance, poise, and clarity, fluency and correctness of speech. Interviewer considered goal to be "reasonable" and noted, "has good potential and is high school graduate." Interviewer commented, "Needs help in grooming and attitudes. She gives a negative impression at interview."

Records and Test Results: An "average" student in school. No record of police contact.

Reading grade level, 10.0; arithmetic grade level, 5.3.

NYC Experience: In the Co-Op a little more than nine months with one NYC work assignment. Terminated by program for poor attendance thought to be due to "lost interest."

No supervisor evaluation of work assignment.

Overall improvement in employability rated "3."

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee was unemployed and looking for work at the time of follow-up and she had had no employment since leaving the Co-Op a little more than eight months previously.

Enrollee rated the usefulness of Co-Op at "4" and wrote that the "most useful" part was ". . .the whole Co-Op program, learning shorthand and speedwriting." She disliked nothing about her experience and there was nothing that she could think of that might make a person not want to get into Co-Op.

In 10 years, enrollee wanted to be working as a "Beautician," thought her chances of getting this kind of work were "fairly good," and that nothing would hold her back. Follow-up age: 20.

Case 15 left the Co-Op after only a month. Her subsequent experience in the business world suggests that she would have benefited from a longer Co-Op enrollment and particularly from an NYC-OJT work assignment. The Co-Op feedback mechanisms would have enabled her to reach a truer judgment of her performance and avoid, perhaps, the follow-up situation in which she planned to "go back" to an employer who wouldn't have her. This enrollee's need for reality counseling was apparent to some of the Co-Op staff, and was emphasized by the conflict that led to the enrollee's premature departure from the program. Although this enrollee left too soon, she had made considerable progress during her NYC-Co-Op enrollment. At the critical time, however, this enrollee's relationship with the Co-Op staff had not been sufficiently established to surmount the crisis. Routine follow-up counseling might have been effective in this case.

Case 15: Negro female. Dropped out of school after 11th grade, single, no children, living in two-parent family of eight. Out of school for 10 months, and no job since in-school NYC. Enrollment age: 19.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in the NYC and enrollee reported herself to be a "reasonably good" clerk typist. Lifetime occupational goal: "Secretary." Interviewer rated her "4" in all areas and considered her goal to be "reasonable." Interviewer wrote, "Enrollee shows great interest in this field." It was also noted that enrollee "has good potential but chip-on-shoulder attitude about (racial) prejudice."

Records and Test Results: A "poor" student and left school because of poor grades. No record of police contact.

General Clerical Skills percentile, 10. No other test results reported.

NYC Experience: Enrollee was in regular NYC with a clerical work assignment for 20 months. She transferred to the Co-Op when it was organized in order to improve her clerical skills. She was in the program for a month, leaving it on her own initiative to take a regular job.

Enrollee was felt to have made comparatively little ("2") improvement in overall employability in Co-Op and, in fact, her short experience may have had a detrimental aspect in that "enrollee and reading instructor had severe personality conflict and enrollee was withdrawn from class." Interviewer wrote, "Enrollee was accepted in Business Co-Op--this was her first success; she was certain she could not pass the tests. After acceptance, she found permanent employment on her own and did not participate in Business Co-Op."

Enrollee Follow-Up: The job the enrollee found on terminating from the Co-Op lasted three and one-half months, shortly after which she found another job that lasted, she reported, 13 months. She was pregnant at the time of follow-up, neither working nor looking for work, but she hoped to go back to her most recent employer later on.

This enrollee was very critical of the Co-Op, reporting that there was "nothing useful" about it. What she disliked about her Co-Op experience was "the whole general set-up--you could drag in at nine o'clock or at ten o'clock--you'd talk when you wanted to or laugh or shout--the teachers were strict--there wasn't enuf room or enuf books." She thought there was "nothing" about Co-Op that might make a person want to get into it, but that a person might not want Co-Op "if they thought it was a school . . .but after they got there they would find out it wan't a school. Also there was an awful lot of partiality shown." Follow-up age: 22.

Employer Follow-Up: Supervisor reported a somewhat shorter period of employment and rated enrollee's work as "unsatisfactory, but showed signs of improvement." Supervisor wrote that enrollee "went on one week vacation and didn't return. Haven't heard from her since." Supervisor commented, "very evasive when questioned. Not the type of person I would hire if I was running a business of my own."

Case 16 illustrates, albeit negatively, the importance of several aspects of Co-Op operation: the provision of realistic work training; the maintenance of a work-relevant context; the interpretive function of counseling; and, finally, the role that could be filled by routine follow-up. The enrollee in this case had no work training in her five-month enrollment, and counseling did not help her to interpret concentration on classroom work as either necessary or valuable. She left the program prematurely for "family" reasons, but counseling (or other) contact with her was so tenuous that the program had no information concerning her plans. While it is possible that this enrollee, in fact, "moved"--as the program information indicated--and had returned to her original address at the time of follow-up, the likelihood is that she lost interest in the program and quit. After leaving the Co-Op this enrollee was continuously unemployed, a sequel that might have been changed had the enrollee been helped to view her Co-Op experience as a work-relevant experience in which she was achieving.

It is of interest that, although this enrollee mentioned a number of useful aspects of Co-Op, she rated the overall usefulness of the program at "3" and wrote that a person might not want to get into the program because "it takes so long to find a permanent job."

Case 16: Negro female. Dropped out of school after 11th grade. Single, one child, living in mother-only, welfare-assisted family of five. Out of school nearly two years and never had a job lasting 30 days or more. Enrollment age: 18.

Beginning Interview: Clerical preparation in high school, adult education and in-school NYC. Enrollee felt competent to perform office clerical work "reasonably well." Lifetime occupational goal: "to become an office secretary." Interviewer rated her "2" in posture and grammar, and "4" in all other areas. Interviewer considered goal to be "reasonable" in view of "past and present training."

Records and Test Results: An "average" student in her three years of night school. IQ: 92. No record of police contact.
Reading grade level, 7.9; arithmetic grade level, 5.9.

NYC Experience: In the Co-Op a little over five months and worked exclusively at the Education Center. Left prematurely on her own initiative.

Enrollee's overall employability improvement rated "3" and "interviews and testing helped _______ realize her limitations and work to remediate them." Enrollee reported to have "moved" and no program record of enrollee's post-Co-Op plans.

Enrollee Follow-Up: Enrollee living at enrollment address. She reported that she had left Co-Op for "family reasons" and that she had had no employment in the eight months since leaving. She considered herself to be an unemployed member of the labor force.

Enrollee rated the overall usefulness of the program at "5" and noted a number of useful aspects: "learning to get along better with other people," "learning to work for a boss," "learning good work habits," "earning money," "getting job skills," "continuing education," and "having an interesting job." Enrollee went on to say, though, "The only experience I have gotten from the Co-Op program is learning how to get along with other people." Enrollee disliked what she identified as favoritism, "the way the supervisors had certain people they tried to help," or that "some supervisors had their picks about sending the girls out on jobs. They would send some girls most of the time, without giving the others a chance." A person might want Co-Op, she wrote, in order to get "good work habits;" a person might not want Co-Op because "it takes so long in order to find a permanent job."

In 10 years, enrollee wanted to be doing "secretarial work." She rated her chances of getting this kind of work as "not so good," explaining that "education" might hold her back. At the same time, she reported that she was "trying to do" something about her lack of education.

Enrollee commented, "I feel that every girl that go's into the program, the supervisors and counselors should do everything possible to help them find a job. And all persons without the proper education should be made to realize the importance of their education and encouraged to try and get their proper education." Follow-up age: 19.

Summary

The cases reviewed in this chapter have illustrated the successes which can be achieved through a clerical skill training program which alternates training and work experience. The importance of help in placement, was repeatedly illustrated.

At the same time, the cases demonstrate some of the program limitations. Effective counseling during the period immediately following Co-Op enrollment often seems crucial to the realization of benefits from Co-Op training and it is probable that routine follow-up during this period might have led to better results. The more widespread use of multiple enrollments, and the substitution of furloughs for disciplinary terminations, might, in many cases, have more effectively enhanced employability--particularly if these practices were joined to routine follow-up. Finally, alternative skill training opportunities would probably enhance the quality of participation in each such training program.

IX

Conclusions

The results of this study showed that the Co-Op significantly enhanced the clerical employability of NYC enrollees. Compared to a Control group, very significantly more Co-Op subjects had achieved good adjustments to the world of work in a follow-up period. The Co-Op's achievements suggest the value of using the Co-Op approach to training in other NYC programs and in other kinds of occupational preparation. This chapter discusses the elements of program effectiveness, possible improvements in program operations, and concludes with a listing of the essential elements of formal skill training programs.

Elements of Program Effectiveness

The success of the Co-Op can be attributed to the vocational relevance of the program and to its effective development of the job skills and attitudes requisite to employment. Clerical jobs were available to qualified applicants and enrollees perceived Co-Op training as enabling them to get such employment. The focus on skill and attitude improvement was maintained by the diagnostic use of work supervisor evaluations. These evaluations identified performance weaknesses in work assignments and determined the emphasis of corrective classroom work.

The alternation of classroom and work experience and the coordination of classroom work with performance deficiencies distinguished the Co-Op program. In the study period the work experience phase of the Co-Op training cycle was modified to some extent. At the outset, diversified work experience gained through assignments to various non-profit agencies was the rule. Experience apparently showed that work experience with cooperating private businesses was more desirable than work experience at NYC User agencies; and work assignments to the same site were judged to be more practical for most enrollees than diversified work experience. The advantages of a business work site were considered to be the fact that a business firm was more likely to maintain a work-oriented atmosphere, insist that reasonable standards be met, and to place the enrollee in a job at the conclusion of the training period if her work was found to be satisfactory. As long as the enrollee was progressing satisfactorially, repeated training tours in the same firm were more likely to lead to regular employment in that firm than diversified training experience. For a trainee who was not progressing satisfactorially, an assignment to a new work site was a choice available to the counselor. The design of the research did not permit a careful comparison of the relative effectiveness of business and NYC work sites, or of diversified and concentrated assignments. Our impressions support the conclusions of the program administration that better results can be achieved from business work sites and that concentrated work assignments achieve the best results for some enrollees.

It is noteworthy that enrollees in the Co-Op study primarily valued the program for preparing them for the world of work--the acquisition of habits, behaviors, skills and experience that would fit them for employment--rather than job placement by itself. The enrollees' perception of the program as a training or development environment was consistent with genuine progress in preparation for employment.

Another striking result was the length of work assignment training required, even for high school graduates, to achieve employability. The average enrollee spent seven months in the program regardless of his prior NYC experience and the more time spent on work assignments, the more likely the enrollee would make a successful post-NYC work adjustment.

Possible Improvements

Study results indicated that, on the whole, the Co-Op was doing a good job. At the same time, the Co-Op study showed several areas in which the program might be strengthened.

1. Follow-Up Counseling

As was demonstrated by several of the case studies reported in Chapter VIII, the immediate post-Co-Op period can be critical to employment success, and routine follow-up, even for enrollees apparently successfully terminated, might salvage some cases of employment maladjustment through counsel or influence with the employer. Some post-Co-Op jobs will not work out and, in these cases, the ex-enrollee may need a new referral. In these instances, routine follow-up and placement help, if needed, could substantially improve the program's effectiveness.

2. Fourloughs

In our previous reports, we have suggested that many enrollees quit or are separated from the NYC for the very reasons that will prevent them from achieving satisfactory employment. They can adjust no better to work training than to the world of work. For such enrollees, termination is a form of personal failure and a furlough, with the opportunity to start again, regardless of the past, holds more promise of program effectiveness. If a furlough policy is combined with follow-up counseling, ex-enrollees who had not achieved employability at the time of termination, can be provided the necessary additional training when she becomes ready for additional preparation. Sometimes this requires a change in attitude; sometimes it requires a change in situation, when it was the enrollee's situation rather than her attitude which was the primary cause of her termination.

3. Alternate Skill Training Programs

The Clerical Co-Op was the only skill training program available to enrollees within the Cincinnati NYC. As we have seen in the case studies, a lack of alternatives probably resulted in the enrollment of some enrollees who were not particularly interested in clerical work. The lack of alternative programs prevented more profitable re-assignments when this lack of interest in clerical training became apparent in the course of an enrollment. Such enrollees are less likely to achieve the training potential of the course and might do much better in a training program for work more in line with their interests. The availability of a range of skill training programs corresponding as closely as possible to the interests of the enrollees could be expected to increase the effectiveness of the NYC program.

Essential Elements in Formal Skill Training Programs

The success of the Clerical Co-Op suggests that it might serve as a model, with appropriate modifications, in other vocational areas. In extending the application of such a formal skill-training program, the following elements should be considered as essential:

1. Selection of job categories for which there are ample employment opportunities and training at a minimal level of competence can be accomplished within six months.

2. Initial training at a Training Center for a period of three to six weeks.

3. On-the-job training for a period of about four weeks, preferably at a work site that provides opportunities for permanent employment.

4, Reassignment to Training Center, concentrating on work deficiencies reported by work supervisor during last work assignment.

5. Provision for remedial education as required.

6. Continuation of the cycle of work experience and formal training until enrollee has been judged ready for employment. Enrollee should be reassigned to a new work site whenever this appears to be necessary.

7. Assistance in obtaining a job after training has been completed.

8. Follow-up counseling until enrollee has made an adequate adjustment to a job.